DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 743 HE 009 242

AUTHOR	Sandusky, Nancy; Johnson, Susan
TITLE	An Evaluation of the Special Services Program for Disadvantaged Students in Post-Secondary Institutions.
INSTITUTION	Kirschner Associates, Inc., Albuquerque, N. Mex.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Kansas City, Mo. Regional Office 7.
PUB DATE	31 Jan 76
CONTRACT	170-76-0001
NOTE	150p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Kirschner Associates, Inc., 2425 Alamo Ave., S.E., Albuquerque, NM 87106
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Ancillary Services; *Disadvantaged Groups; Disadvantaged Youth; Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; Higher Education; Innovation; Language Handicaps; *Low Income; *Non English Speaking; Nontraditional Students; *Physically Handicapped; *Post Secondary Education; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Special Services; Student Characteristics; Student Personnel Services

ABSTRACT

The Special Services Program for Disadvantaged Students is designed to assist certain postsecondary students who require special help to complete their education successfully. Through Federal grants to institutions, special service projects have been established to offer supportive services to low-income, physically handicapped, and limited-English-speaking students. Evaluations were conducted of nine of the Office of Education's region 7 projects. The study, carried out from September 1976 to January 1977, provides descriptive information on ten projects' characteristics, activities, client groups, and performance. In the final report innovative and exemplary features are highlighted and the projects' outcomes are presented, as are the major conclusions of the study. (MSE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED145743

HE009242

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

KIRSCHNER ASSOCIATES, INC.

AN EVALUATION OF THE SPECIAL SERVICES PROGRAM FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS IN POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

Contract No. 170-76-0001

January 31, 1976

by:

Nancy Sandusky
Project Director

and

Susan Johnson, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate

Prepared for:

U.S. Office of Education, Region VII

Conclusions and recommendations in this report are those of the Contractor and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Department of Education, or any other Agency of the Government.

Albuquerque

Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106 / 2425 Alamo Avenue, S.E. / (505) 243-1763 Washington, D.C. 20005 / 733 15th Street N.W. / (202) 638-3423

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Overview of the Special Services Program	2
Participant Eligibility	3
Project Requirements	4
Requirements of Grantee Institutions	5
The Grant Application Process	5
Evaluation Methodology and Procedures	6
Design and Instrument Development	6
Descriptions of Instruments	7
Data Collection Procedures	10
II. INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS AND COMMITMENT	15
Institutional Relationships	15
Structural Relationships	15
Working Relationships	24
Institutional Commitment	30
Admissions Policies	31
Retention Practices	32
Institutional Supportive Services	34
Analysis of Findings	40
III. PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS	42
Project Structure and Staffing Patterns	42
Project Services and Benefits	47
Needs Assessment	47
Tutoring	48
Counseling	51
Remedial Classes	55
Services to the Handicapped	55
Other Benefits and Services	56
Project Assessment of Services	58

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

		Page
IV.	INNOVATIVE AND EXEMPLARY ACTIVITIES	61
	Services	61
	Administrative Procedures	65
	Working Relationships with the Institutions	68
	Analysis of Findings	71
V.	PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS AND ENROLLMENT	75
	Participant Eligibility	75
	Participant Characteristics and Enrollment Practices	79
	Enrollment of the Handicapped	82
	Academic Status of Participants	85
	Analysis of Findings	85
VI.	IMPACTS OF SPECIAL SERVICES PROJECTS	88
	Impacts on Participants	88
	Admission to Institutions	88
	Progress Toward Graduation	95
	Impact on Institutions	100
	Admission and Retention Policies	101
	Compensatory Instruction	104
	Counseling	105
	Minority Group Emphasis	106
	Analysis of Findings	106
VII.	IMPLICATIONS OF STUDY FINDINGS	108
	Compliance with Guidelines	108
	Innovation	110
	Achievement of Goals and Purposes	110
	Institutional Commitment	112

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Characteristics of Institutions Sponsoring Selected Special Services Projects	12
2	Project Placement in Institutional Structure	16
3	Assessment of Project Organizational Relationships to Other Student Services	17
4	Assessment of Project Organizational Relationships to Other Instructional Support Services	19
5	Assessment of Structural Relationships Between Project and Institution: Potential Effect on Recruitment Practices	20
6	Assessment of Structural Relationships Between Project and Institution: Potential Effect on Sources of Recruitment	22
7	Project Status as Indicated by Project Director Position	23
8	Assessment of Project Status in Institution	25
9	Assessment of Working Relationships Between Project and Institution: Mechanisms to Obtain Services	27
10	Assessment of Working Relationships Between Project and Institution: Mechanisms for Identifying Eligible Students	28
11	Assessment of Institutional Admissions Practices	31
12	Assessment of Institutional Retention Practices	33
13	Enrollment Levels and Resources Available to Selected Special Services Projects (for school year 1975-76)	37
14	Staffing Patterns and Proportion of Staff Time Available to Special Services	43
15	Assessment of Functionality of Project Staffing Patterns	45

LIST OF TABLES
(Continued)

Table		Page
16	Project Services and Benefits	49
17	Project Services by Level of Use (no. of participants)	50
18	Frequency of Assessment of Services by Assessment Method Used	59
19	Selected Characteristics of SSP Participants (Proportion of Total Enrollment)	76
20	Selected Statistics on Enrollment of Physically Handicapped	83
21	Proportion of Participants Achieving G.P.A.s of "C" or Better, Fall Semester, 1975	91
22	Proportion of Participants Achieving Grades of "C" or Better in "Tutored Courses "	93
23	Proportions of Participants Completing Last Term and Re-Entering this Term	95
24	Proportions of Participants Leaving School During Spring Semester, 1975	96
25	Proportions of Participants Receiving Adequate Financial Aid	98
26	Proportions of Students Progressing in Academic Status or Graduating (Spring Semester, 1975)	99
27	Impacts on Institution	102

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to acknowledge the contribution and support of all who assisted the evaluation staff during the course of this project. As Project Officer, Bruce J. Boggs, Director, Division of Special Programs, in the U.S. Office of Education, Region VII, was responsible for monitoring the evaluation. Our thanks are extended to Dr. Boggs for his time and efforts in providing information, coordination with local projects, and overall guidance throughout the study. Ms. Linda Carson, of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Associate Project Officer for this contract, lent assistance on technical aspects of the evaluation design.

Our special thanks are also extended to the directors of nine Special Services Projects and to the members of their staffs. We are grateful for their cooperation and response to the evaluation effort and for the countless hours they spent on behalf of this effort. In addition, we wish to recognize the input from the many officials and representatives of the colleges and universities who generously shared their time, information, and opinions with our evaluators.

Accomplishment of the various tasks under this contract required the efforts of several members of the contractor's staff. On-site visits were conducted by Dr. Richard Fink, Mrs. Joanne Fink, Ms. Carol Glassheim, Mrs. Anne Kirschner, and the project director. Dr. Susan Johnson, Mr. Dale Berry, and the project director participated in analyzing the data and preparing this final report. Mr. Berry served as contract administrator during the project.

The contractor's staff takes full responsibility for the findings, interpretations of data, and conclusions presented in this report. These are based on information collected and judgments formulated by the field evaluators and staff analysts, and do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Office of Education.

I

INTRODUCTION

The Special Services Program for Disadvantaged Students is designed to assist certain post-secondary students who require special help to complete their education successfully. This federally funded program is authorized by the Higher Education Act, as amended (P.L. 92-318), and administered by the U.S. Office of Education. Through grants to post-secondary institutions, Special Services Projects have been established to offer supportive services to low-income, physically handicapped, and limited-English-speaking students.

Under a contract with the Office of Education in Region VII,[1] Kirschner Associates, Inc., conducted evaluations of 9 of the Region's 23 Special Services Projects. This evaluation study, carried out from September, 1975, through January, 1976, was designed to fulfill the following purposes:

1. to describe the projects' services, operations, and institutional relationships;
2. to identify and describe innovative and exemplary projects, components, and procedures for replication elsewhere;
3. to assess the effectiveness of the nine projects in achieving legislative and programmatic goals; and
4. to develop a system for continued future monitoring and assessment of Special Services Projects.

This report describes the evaluation procedures, findings, and implications for future monitoring and assessment. The study

[1]Region VII, headquartered in Kansas City, Missouri, serves the states of Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, and Nebraska.

findings are presented herein as a comparative analysis of all the nine projects visited, rather than a series of evaluations of the individual projects. The Evaluation System, including instruments revised on the basis of this study, has been submitted to the Office of Education, Region VII, under separate cover.

The remainder of this introductory chapter is devoted to an overview of the purposes of activities of the Special Services Program and a description of the methodology used in carrying out the evaluation.

Chapters II, III, and IV provide descriptive information on the projects' characteristics, activities, and client groups. Where pertinent, these chapters offer performance assessments as well. In Chapter II, the administration and structure of the projects are examined; in Chapter III, the services and benefits provided by the projects are reviewed and appraised; and in Chapter IV, characteristics of the students served are described.

Chapter V discusses innovative and exemplary features of the projects visited. The assessment of project outcomes is presented in Chapter VI, Program Impacts on Students and Institutions. Chapter VII presents the major conclusions of the study.

OVERVIEW OF THE SPECIAL SERVICES PROGRAM

Special Services is one of several programs authorized by the Higher Education Act to bring post-secondary education within reach of low-income, educationally disadvantaged, and handicapped students. This same legislation provides for financial support, through the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOG); for recruitment, through a program known as Talent Search; and for service programs, such as Upward Bound, Educational Opportunity Centers, and Special Services. Two of the other programs--Upward Bound and Talent Search--frequently operate in close conjunction with Special Services and together make up what is known as the TRIO program. This report, however, focuses only on the Special Services part of TRIO, dealing with Upward Bound and Talent Search peripherally, and only as they affect a Special Services Project in some way.

Since the program's inception in 1970, its characteristics have evolved from the legislation, early guidelines developed by OE, and the policy statements and precedents issued periodically by OE based on interpretations of the law and administrative experience. OE has recently undertaken efforts to compile the guidelines and policies into a comprehensive set of regulations. Proposed regulations resulting from these efforts were published in December, 1975.[1] The overview presented below reflects the program's specifications as noted in the guidelines, policies, and regulations.

Participant Eligibility

Regulations governing the Special Services Program limit its services to students with academic potential who are:

1. economically deprived, i.e., whose family incomes fall below the "low-income" level established annually by the Office of Education,[2]

2. physically handicapped; i.e., who need special instructional materials, facilities or services, because of physical disabilities, to benefit fully from the educational offerings at the institution, or

3. limited in their English-speaking ability, i.e., have a "command of the English language that is inadequate for success in education beyond high school."[3]

Special Services participants are to be selected from among students already enrolled or accepted for enrollment in the grantee institution; funds from project grants are not to be used to recruit students to an institution. Students who qualify on the low-income criterion must also be in need of special instructional and supportive services, as indicated by standardized tests or measures of similar reliability.

---

[1]U.S. *Federal Register*, vol. 40, no. 242, December 16, 1975.

[2]For example, during the 1975-76 school year, the maximum annual income for a family of four is $4,542; for a family of five, $6,364.

[3]U.S. *Federal Register*, *op. cit.*

Project Requirements

The overall goals of a project are to "increase the retention and graduation rates of such students"[1] as those eligible for the program. To accomplish these goals, the projects are required to offer a variety of instructional and counseling services, if not offered by the institution: (1) career and academic counseling, (2) remedial and special classes, (3) tutoring, and (4) other activities to upgrade academic skills of the participants. And, to the extent possible, and "within the constraints of their resources," the projects are required to offer personal counseling. For the physically handicapped students, services and assistance are to be provided as needed for full participation in academic offerings. For the limited-English-speaking student, English language instruction must be provided, through either the project or institution. Projects having a component to serve such students are to offer all services bilingually, including academic and career counseling, remedial classes, tutoring, and so on.

Individual projects are thus obligated to offer a rather broad range of services to a target group with diverse needs and backgrounds. They are, moreover, required to make an analytic diagnosis of each individual participant's academic needs, provide services accordingly, and assess the students' programs continually for the duration of their participation.

The length of time a participant may receive Special Services is not specified in the guidelines. By implication, enrollment duration is contingent on a student's progress; i.e., when he reaches a point at which he has developed academic and survival skills sufficient "to compete at the institution" on his own, he then has no need for Special Services. In effect, a student having achieved this level of progress would no longer be eligible for project services, and the proposed regulations subtly encourage projects to foster independence--to provide services "without creating a long-range dependency on the project."

---

[1] *Ibid.*

Requirements of Grantee Institutions

Post-secondary institutions granted Special Services funds have certain obligations to meet and commitments to make to participating students. For example, the institutions must insure that Special Services students have adequate aid to finance their education. They must agree also to retain these students long enough to adjust to the academic program.[1] Moreover, the institution must agree to make all resources and facilities available to Special Services students.

Commitments to the projects must also be made by the grantee institutions. They must integrate the project into the academic structure and develop a commitment to project goals among administrators and faculty. The institution is also expected to staff the project with persons having appropriate professional and personal qualifications, including a full-time director, and to use the institution's resources and personnel to train this staff.

The Grant Application Process

To obtain a Special Services grant, an institution must submit an application describing its plans for meeting the program requirements, service delivery system, staffing pattern, and budget. Applications must also document the extent of need existing at the institution in terms of numbers of program-eligible students in each category of eligibility.

Grants are generally awarded on either a one-year or three-year basis. However, reapplication must be made annually by all projects; and the Office of Education awards "continuation grants" on the basis of continued need and prior project performance. In making grant award decisions, preference is given operating projects

[1]Previously existing guidelines as well as the proposed regulations stipulate that students must be retained for a proposed minimum of two years in a four-year program and for one year in a two-year program.

applying for continuation awards. The sample Special Services Projects in Region VII are currently in the final year of their three-year grants, and the current grantees will have to reapply in open competition for new one-year grants in order to obtain Special Services funds for next year's operations. Preference in funding will not necessarily be given to projects in current operation; consequently, the present grantees will find themselves in the position of having to compete for the limited funds with other grantees in the region and with institutions applying for grants for the first time.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

The evaluation project was accomplished in five major phases:

1. Design and instrument development,
2. Development of data collection procedures,
3. Pretesting of instruments and procedures,
4. On-site data collection, and
5. Data analysis.

Design and Instrument Development

The purpose of this task was to develop an assessment system to fulfill the requirements of the four evaluation objectives; i.e., a system that would describe project activities, identify exemplary features, and assess effectiveness. The fourth evaluation objective was, of course, to develop an instrument with these capabilties. Essentially, the nine project evaluations constituted a test of the evauation system that was developed.

The evaluation system was based on a preliminary review of the enabling legislation, program guidelines, project applications and reports, and information supplied by the OE Project Officer regarding program performance standards.

These sources enabled us to identify the appropriate elements of the overall evauation design; i.e., the performance standards

to which projects should conform (independent variables), the desired outcomes or goals (dependent variables), and other important variables (intervening variables) which may influence a project's ability to meet standards and achieve goals. Next, *indicators* were developed for each variable, and each *indicator* was translated into a measurable *data item*. For example, one of the outcome variables is the graduation rate of Special Services students from the institution. One *indicator* of this variable is progress toward graduation, which can be measured by the proportion of SSP students who graduated or progressed in academic status (e.g., freshmen who progressed to sophomore status) at the end of the preceding school year. All of the variables thus were translated into collectible data items which became the basic data collection instruments--the *Data Base* and a *Supplementary Data Base*. These instruments elicit descriptive details on the projects and provide a comprehensive profile of project services, resources, structure, policies, institutional relationships, and other factors. The data collection instruments, however, are designed only to describe, not to assess, the projects.

A third instrument, entitled *Assessment Criteria*, was developed for rating project effectiveness and performance and identifying exemplary characteristics. This instrument sets forth the standards of project performance and achievement, which are based on the legislation, program guidelines, and goals. The *Assessment Criteria* document was designed as a *desk monitoring* tool, not as an on-site evaluation instrument. The assessment is made after completion of a site visit, drawing on the information the evaluator and SSP staff have recorded in the *Data Base* and *Supplementary Data Base*.

Descriptions of Instruments

The evaluation system used during the study thus consists basically of three instruments: the *Data Base*, *Supplementary Data Base*, and *Assessment Criteria*.

Data Base

This instrument was designed for the evaluator's use in collecting and compiling raw data. The data items contained in it together make up a comprehensive description of the project structure, activities, and institutional relationships. The instrument is divided into seven sections according to suggested data source.

The initial suggested data source is the project director, and the instrument is designed so that the site visit commences with the director's interview. Data items to be obtained from the director are grouped into three parts:

--Project Characteristics: resources, enrollment process, staffing patterns, administrative practices, and assessment procedures.

--Project-Institutional Relationships: the structural relationships, working relationships, institutional involvement in the project, and institutional changes influenced by the project.

--Project Components: an overview of the project services and service delivery procedures.

The second suggested data source is the project staff. The *Data Base* is designed so that details on project services will be obtained from the individuals directly responsible for providing these services. Thus, tutors, for example, as well as the project director, are asked to describe the tutoring program.

Institutional officials are also suggested as sources of data. From academic deans and deans of students, information is elicited on institution-provided programs and services of special benefit to disadvantaged and handicapped students. Academic deans are asked to describe the institutions' retention and grading policies and how these apply to Special Services students. Admissions officials are questioned about admissions policies, working arrangements with Special Services, and the ethnic and other characteristics of the student body. Financial Aids officials are suggested as

sources of data on the cost of attending the institution, and financial aid to Special Services students. All institutional officials are asked to identify changes in programs, services, or practices at the institution which they feel were influenced in any way by the Special Services Project. The final section of the *Data Base* is used for recording observations on the accessibility and location of project facilities and their suitability for project functions.

Supplemental Data Base

This is a short form for use in recording statistics on student characteristics, attrition, academic performance, instructional service usage, and financial aid. The form was completed by Special Services staff members.

The information indicated in the Supplemental Data Base included only those items which projects are required to keep on file, and which project staff would require in assessing student progress. There were many instances, however, where data were reported by the staff as being unavailable; financial aid information was unavailable at two schools, income-eligibility information was lacking in five. Four schools were unable to supply information on students' current-term GPA's; three had no information on grades in tutored courses.

Assessment Criteria

This instrument contains the performance and achievement standards against which each project is measured. In using this instrument, each project is rated against each standard on a scale of "0" to "4," with "0" indicating total noncompliance or violation of a standard, "1" and "2" indicating various specific degrees of partial compliance, and "3," full compliance with the standard. A score of "4" is an indication of full compliance through an innovative or exemplary process; innovative or exemplary features are to be described on the instrument by the evaluator when giving a "4" rating.

The instrument consists of eight major sections, focusing on student characteristics, eligibility, facilities, policies, structure, institutional relations, component services, and outcome measures. The sections contain varying numbers of criteria. Lack of information at the project sites rendered some outcome criteria unusable, particularly those concerning service usage and outcomes.

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection occurred at nine project sites during the late fall of the 1975-76 school year. Members of the contractor's central staff were responsible for all site visits, data collection, assessment, and reporting. Narrative reports were prepared after the site visits to each of the projects.

Project Sample

The nine projects in the sample were selected by the Project Officer in the Office of Education, Region VII. The sample was selected on the basis of a number of factors that needed to be considered in the pilot testing of the instruments. The principal aim was to test the system in a variety of programs operating under a wide range of conditions, rather than to select a sample representative of all projects in the region. The variables considered in the selection process included project funding level, size of institution, type of institution (i.e., public, private/church-supported, private/non-sectarian), community characteristics and size, institutional emphasis (e.g., vocational, liberal arts), and level of education or training provided (e.g., two-year Associate of Arts degree, four year baccalaureate, professional/graduate training, and so on). Another important consideration in choosing the sites was the promised cooperation on the part of the project staff. The OE Project Officer and the contractor agreed jointly that no project would be visited during this study where objections were raised by local staff, where the timing was inconvenient, or where there were implications of staff reluctance or disinterest in cooperating with the visiting evaluator. The sample of projects, locations, and characteristics

are shown below in Table 1. Two of these nine projects, Rockhurst College and University of Missouri-Kansas City, were designated by the OE Project Officer as pretest sites.

While the sample contains a wide range of programs and great variability, we cannot be certain that it is representative of the Region. Consequently, the findings of this study apply only to the projects in the sample; we cannot assume with any validity that these findings represent what might be occurring at projects outside of the sample.

Pretest

The evaluation design and methodology were pretested during the first week of November, 1975, at Rockhurst College and University of Missouri-Kansas City. Each site visit was completed in approximately 2 1/2 days.

Prior to visiting the sites, arrangements were made by the OE Project Officer to notify the Special Services project directors of the impending visits and to insure project staff cooperation. Following this initial clearance, the contractor's staff also contacted the two project directors by telephone to set up appointments and discuss the study's purposes and data collection procedures. About one week prior to the on-site visits, *Supplementary Data Forms* were mailed to the project directors so that they could begin compiling the statistics they were to furnish. A letter accompanying the form requested that the information be completed by the end of the evaluator's on-site visit; the project staff was thus given two weeks to compile the information for the *Supplementary Data Form*.

The pretest was a full-scale pilot test of all data collection procedures and observations as well as a test of the instrument package. On the basis of the pretest experience, the instruments were revised to increase their effectiveness in collecting the required data, and procedures were modified in some instances to achieve greater efficiency in the data collection process. The revised instruments and procedures were used during site visits to the remaining seven projects.

TABLE 1
Characteristics of Institutions Sponsoring
Selected Special Services Projects

Sponsoring Institution & Location	Approximate Student Population	Funding Support	Level of Instruction Offered	Major Instructional Emphasis
Consortium of Higher Education for Special Services (CHESS)				
Drake University	5,000	Private	4-year + graduate study	Professional
Des Moines Area Community College		Public	2-year	Vocational
Grand View Des Moines, Iowa	900	Lutheran	3-year	Liberal Arts
Iowa Lakes Community College Estherville and Emmetsburg, Iowa	1,500	Public	2-year	Vocational & Liberal Arts
Hutchinson Community Junior College Hutchinson, Kansas	2,400	Public	2-year	Vocational & Liberal Arts
Luther College Decorah, Iowa	1,850	Lutheran	4-year	Liberal Arts
Rockhurst College Kansas City, Missouri	1,200	Jesuit	4-year	Liberal Arts

(Continued on next page)

TABLE 1 (Cont.)
Characteristics of Institutions Sponsoring
Selected Special Services Projects

Sponsoring Institution & Location	Approximate Student Population	Funding Support	Level of Instruction Offered	Major Instructiona Emphasis
St. Louis University St. Louis, Missouri	3,500	Jesuit	4-year + graduate study	Professiona!
Southwest Missouri State University Springield, Missouri	12,000	Public	4-year	Unknown
University of Missouri-Kansas City Kansas City, Missouri	11,000	Public	4-year + graduate study	Professional Liberal Arts
Wichita State University Wichita, Kansas	15,000	Public	4-year + graduate study	Professional

On-Site Evaluations

Advance preparation procedures for the remaining seven site visits were the same as those used prior to the pretests at Rockhurst and UMKC. Preliminary clearance for these visits was obtained by the OE Project Officer. Subsequently, arrangements were made by the contractor and project directors to establish site visit schedules and appointments. Again, the *Supplementary Data Form* was mailed to the project directors in advance of the visits.

All on-site visits were made during the first two weeks of December, 1975. The duration of these visits ranged from 1 1/2 days at the smaller projects, such as Hutchinson and Iowa Lakes, to 2 1/2 days at the large university-based projects.

At each of the sites, initial contact was made with the project director, who provided basic information on the project structure and operations, as called for in the *Data Base*. Interviews were conducted with all other salaried staff members available at the time site visits were made and with several representatives of the various part-time staffs--the tutors, peer counselors, and others who work directly with SSP students. Also, in conformance with the prescribed data collection procedure, representatives of the institution were interviewed--officials from Admissions and Financial Aids, deans of students, and academic deans. In addition, we talked informally with college counselors, directors of learning centers and remedial programs, and academic advisers to gain insights into the nature and quality of institution-provided services available and the relationships of the services to Special Services Projects. Where possible, the evaluators talked informally with SSP students, observed tutoring sessions, sat in on staff meetings, and attended tutor training sessions and other project functions that occurred during the on-site visits. Following the on-site visits the evaluators completed *Assessment Criteria* forms and prepared narrative reports of their findings. These assessments and reports, together with the raw data collected on-site, form the basis for the information and comparative analyses presented in subsequent chapters.

II

INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS AND COMMITMENT

In the course of conducting this study, substantial variation was observed among the projects and the contexts in which they operate. Site visits to the projects revealed general similarities in purpose and goals, but diversity was the rule in almost every other respect. This chapter describes the variety of circumstances and settings in which the nine sample projects operate.

INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Structural Relationships

Special Services Projects are, in most instances, components of either the academic or student affairs divisions of the institutional structures. The two exceptions are at Luther College and Iowa Lakes Community College; at Luther, the project is directly responsible to the Office of the Provost, while at Iowa Lakes it is part of the Special Needs Department. As Table 2 shows, the Rockhurst, St. Louis, and UMKC projects are placed in the academic part of the institutions' structures; at all other schools they are in the student affairs divisions, along with other student personnel services.

Table 3 shows the evaluators' ratings of the structural relationships between projects and other student services such as financial aid, counseling, admissions, and job placement. At most of the schools, the projects are related organizationally to some but not all such services available at the institutions; these projects received ratings of "2". Two projects--those at Wichita and Hutchinson--are closely related to all such services. However, at UMKC and St. Louis University, where Special Services Projects are part of the "academic" rather than the service area, there is no organizational link between the projects and other student services. The Rockhurst project is also part of the

TABLE 2
Project Placement in
Institutional Structure

	Academic	Student Affairs	Other
CHESS			
Drake		X	
DMACC		X	
Grand View		X	
Iowa Lakes			Special Needs Department
Hutchinson		X	
Luther			Office of the Provost
Rockhurst	X		
St. Louis	X		
SMSU		X	
UMKC	X		
Wichita		X	

TABLE 3
Assessment of Project Organizational Relationships to
Other Student Services

CRITERION: The projects' placement in the institutional structure facilitates coordination with other appropriate student services.

EVALUATORS' RATINGS:	CHESS	Hutch-inson	Iowa Lakes	Luther	Rock-hurst	St. Louis	SMSU	UMKC	Wichita
0 No structural relation-ships						X		X	
2 Structurally related to some of the student services available	X		X	X	X		X		
3 Structurally related to all student services available		X							X

academic area, but at this school the academic division includes some of the student services such as academic advising and the Learning Centers--academic counseling and testing services.

Several of the projects are more closely related organizationally to the instructional activities that might benefit SSP students than to the personal supportive services. As Table 4 shows, UMKC, Iowa Lakes, and Luther College have placed the projects in organizational divisions which also contain other remedial instruction such as departmental tutoring programs, reading labs, and learning centers. The Rockhurst project is a component of the academic division of the college which contains compensatory instruction and some supportive services as well. The projects at Hutchinson and St. Louis University are themselves responsible for coordinating some of the remedial efforts for the institutions.

Structural relationships between the projects and institutions were also assessed with respect to their potential effect on participant recruitment. This assessment was made to identify the extent to which projects are associated organizationally with offices and divisions of the institutions which emphasize services to selected groups, such as ethnic minorities or residents of particular neighborhoods. Where such associations exist, there is a possibility that the projects' recruitment practices will be affected. For example, a project which is part of a minority group services program might be influenced to concentrate its publicity and recruitment efforts on members of minority groups. Under these circumstances the possibility exists that the project will assume the image of other programs with which it is associated. If the image is that of a program for a selected group, such as an ethnic minority, the project may fail to attract other needy, eligible students. As Table 5 shows, seven of the projects are organizationally placed to facilitate broad-based recruitment efforts; these projects do not appear to be organizationally related to other services for minorities or other limited groups. However, two projects are closely associated

TABLE 4
Assessment of Project Organizational Relationships to
Other Instructional Support Services

CRITERION: The projects' placement in the institutional structure facilitates coordination with other instruction support services.

EVALUATORS' RATINGS:	CHESS	Hutch-inson	Iowa Lakes	Luther	Rock-hurst	St. Louis	SMSU	UMKC	Wichita
0 No structural relation-ship	X						X		X
2 Structurally related to some instructional support services					X			X	
3 Structurally related to all instructional support services		X	X	X		X			

TABLE 5
Assessment of Structural Relationships
Between Project and Institution:
Potential Effect on Recruitment Practices

CRITERION: Project placement in institutional structure facilitates recruitment of students on the basis of need regardless of cultural background.

EVALUATORS' RATINGS:	CHESS	Hutch-inson	Iowa Lakes	Luther	Rock-hurst	St. Louis	SMSU	UMKC	Wichita
0 Project is part of a division designed to service members of a particular minority group									
1 Project is part of a division unofficially emphasizing service to a select group or groups								X	
2 Project is part of a division which unofficially emphasizes service to various minorities	X								
3 Project is not part of a division which emphasizes services to minorities		X	X	X	X	X	X		X

with services for minority group students. Thus, at these projects, there is possibly an imbalance in the participant recruitment effort with a greater emphasis on attracting ethnic minorities into the project.

Where a project is closely related to another program or organization, the potential also exists for using the other program as a primary source of participants, and thus giving them an advantage in receiving SSP services. As Table 6 shows, only three of the projects appear to be free of these associations: those sponsored by Hutchinson College, Iowa Lakes, and Luther College. Some bias may exist, however, at the remaining schools, which received low ratings of "0" or "1" in the assessment. Projects so rated are closely affiliated organizationally with Upward Bound programs, in the case of Rockhurst and UMKC, and with minority group programs at the other campuses as well. The UMKC project is in a division of the College of Arts and Sciences which includes outreach centers in minority neighborhoods in addition to Upward Bound and Special Services. The St. Louis project is closely related to minority student organizations both structurally and operationally.

The projects have varying levels of status within their respective divisions of these institutions, as shown in Table 7. SSP directors at UMKC and Wichita State are Assistant Deans, while the Luther and Iowa Lakes directors have faculty status. The directors at Rockhurst, St. Louis, and the CHESS project are staff members of the institutions. The Hutchinson and SMSU directors apparently have no official status at the institutions; at Hutchinson, however, the SSP director serves as a member of the Council of Administrators and thus is involved in policy-making functions. Several other project directors serve on committees which influence policies and practicies affecting Special Services students. At Luther College, Rockhurst, and UMKC the SSP directors serve on admissions committees, and the UMKC director is, in addition, a member of the financial aids committee.

TABLE 6
Assessment of Structural Relationships
Between Project and Institution:
Potential Effect on Sources of Recruitment

CRITERION: Project placement in the institutional structure facilitates recruitment of students regardless of association with other programs or organizations.

EVALUATORS' RATINGS:	CHESS	Hutch-inson	Iowa Lakes	Luther	Rock-hurst	St. Louis	SMSU	UMKC	Wichita
0 Project shares staff with another program or organization for low-income or disadvantaged					X			X	
1 Project has a structural relation to one other program or organization for low-income or disadvantaged						X	X		
2 Project is part of a division of the institution containing other programs or organizations for low-income or disadvantaged			X	X					
3 Project has no structural relation to other programs or organizations for low-income or disadvantaged	X	X							X

TABLE 7
Project Status as Indicated
by Project Director Position

	Asst. Dean	Faculty	Staff	Other
CHESS			X	
Iowa Lakes		X		
Hutchinson				Member, Council of Adminstrators
Luther		X		Member, Admissions Committee
Rockhurst			X	Member, Admissions Committee
St. Louis			X	
SMSU				
UMKC	X			Member, Financial Aids Committee Admissions Committee
Wichita	X			

The Special Services Projects often have working relationships and influence that are not always evident from a review of their structural "place" and official status. The St. Louis University project director, for example, participates in all decisions regarding admission and financial aid for potential Special Services students. He thus wields considerable influence over admissions and financial aids practices with respect to disadvantaged students, despite the fact that he is not a committee member or high official of the institution.

Table 8 shows the evaluators' ratings of project status in terms of apparent capability to influence institutional decisions and generate or maintain institutional commitment to the project. Projects at Rockhurst, UMKC, and Wichita received the highest ratings, having directors in high official decision-making capacities. At Iowa Lakes and SMSU the projects were rated as lacking in status and capacity to influence institutional practices affecting the SSPs or their target populations.

Working Relationships

To varying degrees and in varying ways, the projects have been integrated into the operations as well as the structures of the institutions. Some appear to be solidly integrated into the institutions or into institutional programs with goals similar to those of Special Services. Other projects have maintained separate operations and identities while relying on other institutional services to supplement or aid SSP activities. Still others are neither closely integrated into the institutions nor have they evolved as strong separate entities.

At Hutchinson, Luther, and Rockhurst, Special Services have been integrated as components of institution-wide compensatory and counseling programs. The Hutchinson project coordinates all tutoring and career counseling services for the college. The Special Services Project at Luther is part of a comprehensive program for academically high-risk students. The Rockhurst project operates

TABLE 8
Assessment of Project Status
in Institution

CRITERION: Project placement in the institutional structure facilitates encouraging institutional commitment to project goals.

EVALUATORS' RATINGS:	CHESS	Hutch-inson	Iowa Lakes	Luther	Rock-hurst	St. Louis	SMSU	UMKC	Wichita
0 Project has neither the status nor structural relationships to influence institution									
1 Division containing SSP has influential status but SSP does not			X				X		
2 The SSP has sufficient status to influence institution	X			X					
3 The SSP director has status to influence institution						X			
4 SSP director serves in decision-making capacity				X	X			X	X

as part of the Learning Center, a facility offering a variety of individualized testing and instructional services for students at all achievement levels. These three projects work closely with other divisions of the institutions to identify eligible students, assess student needs and progress, and obtain services for SSP students outside of the projects. However, there is evidence that the Rockhurst project is not utilizing all the services that it could (see Table 9). There is, at the college, a special instructional and guidance program for high-risk freshmen which a high college official indicated has no relationship with the Federal programs--the SSP tutoring center and the institution's learning center. The Rockhurst project also does not, as a matter of routine, receive listings identifying all eligible students (see Table 10), although this is because services are available on request, and students initiate contact with the project.

The projects at UMKC, Wichita, St. Louis, and CHESS have developed strong ties and working relationships with the institutions while maintaining separate identities of their own. Their ties and relationships to the institutions have come about principally to aid the project operations and expand benefits to participants. The projects receive information, for example, which enables them to identify potential participants. As shown in Table 10, the St. Louis and UMKC projects do not necessarily receive listings of all income-eligible students, although they have access to the information when needed. The SSP staffs participate in joint efforts with the institutions to publicize the schools and the projects. Projects receive notices from the faculty when students perform poorly in their courses, and project students often receive special consideration in admissions, financial aid, registration, and retention decisions. In addition, the projects have made appropriate arrangements to obtain remedial and counseling services for SSP students which the project is unable to furnish directly. However, there is some evidence that UMKC students could benefit by increased use of the Learning Center for reading and

TABLE 9
Assessment of Working Relationships
Between Project and Institution:
Mechanisms to Obtain Services

CRITERION: The project has developed cooperative relationships with the institution which enable the project to utilize existing institutional services to meet the needs of project praticipants.

EVALUATORS' RATINGS:	CHESS	Hutch-inson	Iowa Lakes	Luther	Rock-hurst	St. Louis	SMSU	UMKC	Wichita
0 Project is duplicating other services:									
Tutoring									
Basic Skills Classes									
Remedial Reading									
Counseling									
Other									
1 Project is not utlizing:									
Tutoring									
Basic Skills Classes									
Remedical Reading									
Counseling			X						
Other									
2 Project use of services could be improved:									
Tutoring							X		
Basic Skills Classes								X	
Remedial Reading								X	
Counseling								X	
Other					X				
3 Project uses all appropriate services; no duplication of services is evident.	X	X		X		X			X

TABLE 10
Assessment of Working Relationships
Between Project and Institution:
Mechanisms for Identifying Eligible Students

CRITERION: The project has developed cooperative relationships with the institution which enable the project to obtain information necessary to identify all low-income and handicapped students enrolled at the institution.

EVALUATORS' RATINGS:	CHESS	Hutch-inson	Iowa Lakes	Luther	Rock-hurst	St. Louis	SMSU	UMKC	Wichita
0 Working arrangements with appropriate offices have not been developed.									
1 Relationships exist that would enable SSP to obtain information but it does not do so.					X			X	
2 SSP works only with some offices; only part of eligible population may be identified.						X			
3 SSP obtains information on all eligible students.	X	X	X	X			X		X

study skills instruction. Although some SSP students are enrolled at the Learning Center, many more *should* be, according to the tutors. The reason they are not is due more to the Learning Center's limited space than to a lack of cooperation between the two programs. The SSP and Learning Center staffs work cooperatively in many respects, and SSP expects to refer more students to the Center when it can handle them.

At Iowa Lakes and SMSU, Special Services Projects have developed few working relationships with the institutions. At Iowa Lakes, the projects' only working arrangements are with the Financial Aids Office--which furnished a list of low-income students--and the Learning Center--which provides remedial instruction for 8 of the 24 SSP students. The institution offers an impressive array of other services for the academically deficient and handicapped, as well as personal, academic, and career counseling services. There are, for example, career orientation and exploration, psychological evaluation, social work services, and vocational rehabilitation programs offered by the college but not being utilized by SSP students. These programs are, like SSP, components of the Special Needs Department, yet SSP has little if any contact with them. According to one official at the institution, the Special Services Project suffers from a lack of visibility and is not as fully integrated into the institution as it should be. He feels that, as a result, the project does not fulfill its potential role in serving and coordinating services for the low-income, academically disadvantaged student.

At SMSU the Special Services Project is isolated structurally and physically from all its possible resources, with the exception of the Financial Aids Office which furnishes income information on potential enrollees. There is little or no contact between Special Services and the institution's counseling and remedial services, and there are no other institutional services supporting the project.

INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT

Commitment and support from the grantee institution are critical to successful performance of Special Services Projects. Institutional support is, in fact, *required* if the projects are to achieve the goals of assisting disadvantaged and physically handicapped students to complete their studies. The institutions must, first of all, admit students in these target groups, and in many instances such admissions require liberalizing or making exceptions to previous standards and requirements. The institutions then must, in many cases, liberalize traditional retention policies or make exceptions for disadvantaged students to allow them sufficient time to overcome past deficiencies and "catch up" with their nondisadvantaged peers. Liberalized retention policies are needed to avoid what is known at one institution as the "revolving-door syndrome," in which academically high-risk students are admitted, only to be suspended after their first semester. In addition, the institution's support is needed to supplement the services which SSPs provide: the financial aid for low-income students, special aids and equipment for the handicapped, special instructional services, technical remediation, and professional counseling for students with problems. Institutional support in the form of financial and other resources is also important to the projects, not only because these resources help upgrade project quality but also because they demonstrate in a tangible way the institution's commitment to the project goals and its encouragement and support of the participating students.

Admissions Policies

Four projects in the sample, shown in Table 11, enjoy special consideration from the institutions regarding potential SSP participants; admission requirements are waived for academically deficient students whom the project directors feel have the potential for overcoming their deficiencies. The project directors here participate actively in admissions decisions, either officially as members of admissions committees (at Rockhurst and UMKC) or as consultants (at Drake and St. Louis Universities).

TABLE 11
Assessment of Institutional
Admissions Practices

ASSESSMENT CRITERION: Institutional policy allows admittance to academically deficient students with success potential.

EVALUATORS' RATINGS:	CHESS	Hutch-inson	Iowa Lake	Luther	Rock-hurst	St. Louis	SMSU	UMKC	Wichita
0 Students not admitted unless requirements are met							X		
1 Exceptions are made where deficiency is due to lack of educational apportunity									
2 Entry requirements are waived for SSP participants	X				X	X		X	
3 Open admissions		X	X	X					X

The remaining five institutions follow open admissions policies, allowing entrance to all residents of their service areas having high school diplomas or equivalencies. One of these schools, however, "opens" its admission only during the spring semester; during the fall term admission is closed to the most academically deficient, i.e., students ranking in the lowest third of their high school class. The policy was instituted at the state level of the statewide university system and reportedly must be strictly adhered to at this branch of the institution.

Retention Practices

Retention practices at most schools in the sample are more stringent than the criterion for Special Services Projects (shown in Table 12). Only three projects are located at institutions where the criterion is met or exceeded for all students; these projects are at Hutchinson, Iowa Lakes, and Rockhurst.

At 5 of the 6 schools having strict retention policies, special consideration is given SSP students when academic suspension is at issue. Two of the schools--Drake and St. Louis Universities--demonstrate commitment to the projects by customarily excepting SSP particpants from the retention-suspension policies. At three schools, Luther, UMKC, and Wichita--exceptions are usually made for individual SSP students at the request of the SSP staff. At UMKC, for example, the project director acts as an advocate to prevent suspension of students who have the potential to succeed. According to the director, when students with potential fail academically, it is often due to personal, family, or financial problems which detract from their concentrations and attendance. In these circumstances, the staff attempts to help solve the "outside" problem and waive the suspension so that the students can stay in school. Usually the school officials are cooperative in giving these students a second chance. For SSP participants who seem to lack incentive or capability for college work, the staff does not make special efforts to have them retained. Rather, attempts are made to identify these

TABLE 12
Assessment of Institutional
Retention Practices

ASSESSMENT CRITERION: The institution allows academically deficient students time to overcome deficiencies. (Students are retained two years at four-year institutions and one year at two-year institutions.)

EVALUTORS' RATINGS:	CHESS	Hutch-inson	Iowa Lakes	Luther	Rock-hurst	St. Louis	SMSU	UMKC	Wichita
0 Retention policy is more stringent; no exceptions are made.							X		
1 Retention policy is more stringent; but exceptions are made in cases advocated by SSP staff.				X				X	X
2 Retention policy is more stringent; but exceptions are made for all SSP students	X					X			
3 Retention policy meets criterion		X							
4 Retention policy is more liberal than criterion			X		X				

students before they fail and to help them find alternatives. The success of the project in appealing academic suspensions may be due partially to the practice of advocating only for students with a probability of succeeding in school. Nevertheless, the fact remains that at UMKC, and probably Luther and Wichita State as well, these students would likely be suspended after a year without the SSP staffs' intervention on their behalf. The retention practice at these three institutions thus does not indicate the existance of an official commitment to the project, although it does suggest a flexibility and an awareness of the disadvantaged student which might not exist without the SSP.

Retention practices at SMSU are stricter than SSP guidelines, and the school gives no special consideration to SSP participants. These participants, in effect, are subject to the same regulations as all other students at the school, and so far the institution has demonstrated no interest in making a special commitment to the project in this respect.

Institutional Supportive Services

While the Special Services Projects have the capacity to furnish valuable services to their target groups, the projects are unable to meet their recruitment totally. For example, substantial financial aid is necessary for most of these students. Some may need specialized remedial work, beyond the scope of the project's services and resources. Handicapped students require a variety of services and aids, depending on the nature of their handicap, and these often require greater financial investments than projects can afford. Thus, the institution must supplement the Special Services offerings in order for participants to finance and benefit from the postsecondary programs.

All institutions in the sample offer financial aid services where students can obtain a package of direct grants, scholarships, and loans to finance their education. Financial aid assistance is

supplemented by work-study and other part-time employment opportunities. At four of the sample schools (Luther, St. Louis, UMKC, and Wichita) priority financial aid service is given SSP participants.

Priority registration is given SSP participants at Luther and UMKC. The students there are thus assured of the widest selection of courses, including slower-paced or remedial sections of courses which many of the SSP students need.

All of the institutions now provide specialized remedial and compensatory educational services, usually through "learning centers" and "reading labs" staffed by professionally qualified specialists. Professional counseling and testing services are offered by the institutions as well. While these services were not designed specifically as SSP resources, they are available to SSP participants as well as any other students on the campuses. These institutional resources are more a demonstration of concern for disadvantaged students generally than a commitment to the Special Services Projects in particular. Nevertheless, these are resources that SSP participants can use and in most cases they indicate the existance of at least some support for the SSP goals of helping disadvantaged students. At Iowa Lakes and Luther College, commitment to the disadvantaged is particularly strong. Both institutions have developed comprehensive programs to help "high-risk" students succeed in college. At Luther College the SSP is an integral part of the larger "high-risk student" program and SSP participants receive many services beyond these financed by the project. At Iowa Lakes, on the other hand, the project operates independently of all similar programs. In fact, any services furnished SSP participants by the other programs are paid for by the project.

Special resources for the physically handicapped are less prevalent than services for the academically deficient among the sample schools. Only three schools--Rockhurst, Iowa Lakes, and Luther College--have sufficient resources for this group.

Iowa Lakes has a comprehensive program for the handicapped, and the institution specializes in vocational rehabilitation of this group. Rockhurst and Luther have resources for developing or purchasing materials as needed. The other schools, however, appear to lack the necessary educational resources and aids for the handicapped.

With the exception of Iowa Lakes, all sample institutions donate funds, personal services, materials or facilities for the projects. Some donate all of these; some provide only the office space. Institutional commitment in the form of donated resources varies substantially. As Table 13 shows, all institutions except Iowa Lakes provide office space. Three institutions provide funds for project operations; St. Louis University provides substantially more than $100,000 annually so that the project can also serve students ineligible under SSP guidelines. Hutchinson Community College contributes about $6,000 yearly for much the same reason--to pay for tutoring and counseling for students not eligible for the project, UMKC donates $2,500, which pays stipends to SSP summer participants. Scholarship funds also have been established by St. Louis and Wichita State for SSP participants. Direct professional personnel services are provided by UMKC, Luther College, and Rockhurst. Work-study students are assigned to projects at UMKC and St. Louis University.

The Consortium representing the three Iowa institutions is itself an indication of commitment to the success of Special Services. Through the Consortium's paid staff the projects receive administrative, fiscal management, and clerical support. Representatives of the three institutions are involved in the projects through the Consortium's board of directors which consists of two top officials from each institution.

It is difficult to rank the institutions by level of commitment, due to the variety in the ways of demonstrating commitment and the near impossibility of quantifying its value. But

TABLE 13
Enrollment Levels and Resources Available
to Selected Special Services Projects
(for school year 1975-76)

	No. Students		Federal Funds	Institutional Funds	Funds From Other Sources	Value of Space From Institution	Personnel Provided by Institution	Other Resources
	Target	Actual						
CHESS Drake DMACC Grand View	--	380	$98,500	None	None	Space donated, but value not determined	CHESS Administrator Clerical Aid	None
Iowa Lakes C.C.	29	24	$21,000	None	None	None	None	Language Ctr. & Office Space (Upward Bound)
Hutchinson Community J.C.	175	175	$50,000	$6,310	None	Space donated, but value not determined	None	None
Luther	50	101	$19,000	None	None	Space donated, but value not determined	Study Skills Specialist (1/2 time)	None
Rockhurst	60	85	$30,000	None	None	Space donated, but value not determined	Resource persons for tutor training. Learning Center Resources	None

(Continued on next page)

TABLE 13 (Cont.)
Enrollment Levels and Resources Available
to Selected Special Services Projects
(for school year 1975-76)

	No. Students		Federal Funds	Institutional Funds	Funds From Other Sources	Value of Space From Institution	Personnel Provided by Institution	Other Resources
	Target	Actual						
St. Louis Univ.	200	216	$54,200	$110,420	$1,000	$26,000	None	Tutors (work/study) Peer Counselors (work/study) Summer School funds
SMSU	50	63	$25,000	None	None	$ 1,200	None	$10,000 Carry over of 1974-75 SSP funds
UMKC	350	206	$64,000	$ 2,500	None	$24,000	Counselor (2/5 time)	Counselor Intern (work/study) Clerks (work/study)
Wichita State		265	$95,000	Scholarship fund for SSP students	Various, As needed for students' personal expenses	Space donated, but value not determined	None	None

considering all factors, we can subjectively rank the commitment levels as being either high, medium, or low. In the high commitment classification, we would place St. Louis University, Wichita State, UMKC, and the three schools involved in the CHESS project. These institutions donate substantial funds, personnel, and/or services; they give status to the projects and involve staff in decisions important to the projects. Moreover, SSP participants are given special consideration in admission, retention, and financial aid. Essentially the institutions provide a climate that supports the activities and philosophy of the Special Services Projects.

Projects at Hutchinson, Rockhurst, and Luther College operate in supportive contexts, but the institutional commitment appears somewhat less than that of the four high-commitment schools. There is less support in the way of services to the projects and there is no financial support from the institutions that benefits SSP participants directly. However, the projects in these institutions are highly respected and have developed good working relationships with institutional divisions which benefit SSP students. Also, the project directors have status enough to participate in admissions and other student services decisions. The Hutchinson, Luther, and Rockhurst projects also *contribute* to these institutions as well as benefiting from them. The Rockhurst and Hutchinson projects coordinate tutoring services for the institutions, and the Hutchinson project in addition provides all career counseling at the college.

Iowa Lakes and SMSU show virtually no evidence of commitment to their Special Services Projects. They make few resources available to the projects, and at Iowa Lakes the services and space that are provided are paid for out of SSP or Upward Bound funds. SMSU has admission and retention policies that counteract with project goals. Both projects lack coordination with the rest of the institutions, and are effectively isolated from other activities and support on the campus that could enhance the programs.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The nature and strength of a project's working arrangements with an institution appear to bear little relation to the project's placement within the institution. The projects do not necessarily develop closer working relationships with divisions to which they are related organizationally. Moreover, the absence of *organizational* linkages does not necessarily result in an absence of cooperation between the projects and institutional services. Working arrangements are developed as necessary for the projects, and students benefit without regard to organizational and structural boundaries. And, in some instances, working arrangements have failed to materialize when a project is *structurally* close to institution services that seem potentially beneficial to SSP students.

Project status, as indicated by the directors' role and position, may have a more direct bearing than structural placement on the projects' ability to develop operational relationships. The two projects with the least status appear to be making the least use of campus services, have developed the fewest working relationships, and are the least integrated into campus services and programs.

In terms of obtaining information on students, all projects have developed the relationships necessary to identify eligible students. Structural relationships, status, and integration of projects into institutional operations appear to have very little to do with the projects' ability to make these arrangements. The fact that some projects do not obtain it is due more to the recruitment practices the projects follow than to lack of contact with sources of the information.

Recruitment is the only area of project activity which appears to be related to the project-institutional structure. Projects with a close structural relationship to organizations serving selected groups tend to limit their sources of potential participants.

Several patterns emerge in examining the relationships among levels of institutional commitment, project status, and integration of projects into the institutions. Projects in this sample located at highly committed institutions (St. Louis, Wichita, UMKC, and CHESS) have two other traits in common: high status in the institutions and a high degree of independence. While maintaining strong identities of their own, the projects have established cooperative working relationships with other resources of the institutions.

Projects having a *medium* level of institutional commitment are characterized by integration into institutional programs and lack strong identities of their own. These projects (Rockhurst, Hutchinson, and Luther) have somewhat less status than the projects where institutional commitment is high.

Where institutional commitment is minimal (at Iowa Lakes and SMSU), the projects have minimal status in the institutions and are isolated, in an operational sense, from many of the institutions' resources.

III

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

This chapter describes two important aspects of the sample projects: the staffing arrangements and the various services and benefits the nine projects offer.

PROJECT STRUCTURE AND STAFFING PATTERNS

Although there is substantial variation in the staffing patterns of the projects, they can be grouped into two general classifications. As shown in Table 14, the first grouping contains projects with minimal staffs of one full-time professional staff member or less with direct program operation responsibilities. In the second grouping are projects having more than one full-time professional.

Projects in the minimally staffed grouping have an uncomplicated operational structure, with only one or two permanent staff members supervising a retinue of part-time employees--the tutors, peer counselors, and clerical staffs. Five of the projects operate in this manner, although CHESS and SMSU projects have atypical structural arrangements. The CHESS projects operate at three institutions, with a project director responsible for coordinating campuses. CHESS also has a position for a Spanish-American Students Coordinator, which was filled full-time until December 31. His functions have included organizing groups for Spanish-American students on the three campuses and encouraging them to participate in the SSPs. The SMSU project is atypical in that the director is located on another campus where he has other responsibilities. He spends virtually no time on SSP; the person filling the coordinator position has full charge of the SMSU project operations.

Projects at Hutchinson, St. Louis, UMKC, and Wichita have substantially more personnel and more complex structural arrangements

TABLE 14
Staffing Patterns and Proportion of Staff Time Available to Special Services

Minimal Staff	Project Director	Project Coord.	Tch'g Spec.	Couns.	Asst. Dir.	Supr.	Tutors (No.)	Peer Couns. (No.)	Sec-retary	Intake Adviser	Span.-Amer. Coord.
CHESS	100%						59				100%*
Drake		100%									
Grand View		100%									
DMACC		100%									
Iowa Lakes	20%						1				
Luther	12%	50%					12		20%		
Rockhurst	40%	100%			20%	50%	25	4	20%		
SMSU		100%					34	6	100%		
Full Staff											
Hutchinson	100%		100%+ 1 p.t.**	2 p.t.**			28		100%+ 1 p.t.**	p.t.**	
St. Louis	25%	100%	100%	100%	50%		9	12			
UMKC	100%			40%+ 1 p.t.**	100%	50%	20		100%+ p.t.**	100%	
Wichita	100%	100%	50%		100%	100% 50%	16	16	100%		

*Position not filled
**Part-time position

than the other projects. Each of these four projects has a full-time director or coordinator, responsible for overall supervision and management, and like the minimally staffed projects they have numerous part-time workers. In addition, these fully staffed projects include professional remedial instructors and professional counselors. There also are supervisors in charge of the tutoring and peer counseling activities. These projects are thus staffed to provide more services to students and to serve greater numbers of students than are the minimally staffed projects.

Evaluators' ratings of the staffing patterns are given in Table 15. With two exceptions, the projects appear to be appropriately staffed to discharge basic project functions. At Iowa Lakes and SMSU--two of the minimally staffed projects--there are obvious inadequacies in the staffing patterns. Other projects have generally functional staffing patterns, although fewer than half have staff members with responsibilities for staff training and assessment and for assessing quality of project services.

Tutors are employed at all projects, and peer counselors at four: Rockhurst, SMSU, UMKC, and Wichita. Tutors and peer counselors are responsible for much of the direct service provided SSP participants and are the principal source of contact between participants and project staff. Consequently, tutors and peer counselors play an important role in these projects.

Tutors are part-time program employees, with special skills or expertise in the subjects they tutor; they are selected on the basis of faculty or academic recommendations and high academic achievement in their fields (technically a B average, although exceptions are frequently made). The tutors must also demonstrate a sensitivity to the needs and problems of the type of students the SSP enrolls. Tutors are faculty members, graduate students, and upperclassmen in most cases; the two junior college projects hire sophomores as tutors. Two projects--Rockhurst and UMKC--attempt to hire tutors who have taken the same courses from the

TABLE 15
Assessment of Functionality of Project
Staffing Patterns

ASSESSMENT CRITERION: The project is adequately staffed to fulfill the functions of:

	CHESS	Hutch-inson	Iowa Lakes	Luther	Rock-hurst	St. Louis	SMSU	UMKC	Wich-ita
Identifying students most in need of project services	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3
Recruiting target number of eligible students	0	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Providing overall management and staff supervision	3	3	1	3	3	3	0	3	3
Maintaining contact with institutional officials	3	3	1	3	3	3	0	3	3
Assessing student needs and progress	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
Maintaining records of student needs and progress	3	3	0	3	3	3	3	3	3
Training staff and assessing staff performance	2	3	0	3	3	3	0	1	1
Assessing quality of project services	2	3	0	2	3	3	2	0	3

0 = Function is not assigned to project staff

1 = Function is assigned to staff with insufficient time to devote to it

2 = Function is assigned to staff with insufficient interest or capability to fulfill it

3 = Function is appropriately staffed

same instructors as the students. The St. Louis and Wichita projects try to select tutors from among SSP participants and former participants.

Most projects offer orientation or training of some sort for tutor staffs; 7 of 9 projects provide at least an orientation program covering administration and procedural matters. Three projects--Rockhurst, St. Louis, and UMKC--provide training in instructional techniques before tutors begin their work. Regular in-service training or tutor group meetings are held by two of the projects--Rockhurst and St. Louis. Tutors at Hutchinson and Luther College receive in-service instruction via printed materials from the project staff. Rockhurst and St. Louis appear to have the most comprehensive of the training programs; Rockhurst also provides tutors with a reference manual describing their functions, responsibilities, and administrative matters. At both schools, meetings are held regularly with individual tutors to discuss student progress. Tutor training group sessions are scheduled at least monthly at the Rockhurst, Luther College, and St. Louis projects.

Peer counselors at Rockhurst, St. Louis, and Wichita are selected on the basis of the project staffs' assessments of their maturity and sensitivity to the SSP target group. The Wichita and St. Louis projects have policies which give preference for these positions to former SSP participants. The SMSU coordinator reported that work experience and dependability are the primary criteria for selecting peer counselors. The four projects all select peer counselors from among students enrolled at the institutions. Pre-service and in-service training for peer counselors is offered at three projects. Rockhurst, St. Louis, and Wichita project staffs hold formal, regularly scheduled sessions covering administrative and technical matters. For SMSU peer counselors the training is more informal and consists mainly of instructions given on an *ad hoc* individual basis covering procedural and administrative matters.

The diversity in staffing patterns and administrative practices among the projects suggests similar diversity in the servie offerings and delivery procedures, described in the following section.

PROJECT SERVICES AND BENEFITS

Needs Assessment

Delivery of services under the Special Services Program begins with the needs assessment process. Identifying the students who need what Special Services offers is in fact an important factor in shaping the nature of the services and the character of the delivery system.

Initial needs assessment focuses on identifying academic deficiencies; other needs are assessed informally or they become apparent in the process of providing services to meet the academic needs. In 5 of the 9 projects,[1] academic deficiencies are identified by the project staffs on the basis of high school grades and standardized test scores. At two other sites--Hutchinson and SMSU--needs are assessed jointly by staff and participants during individual conferences. Some amount of student self-assessment of needs occurs at all schools, and students who find they perform poorly in a course or all courses go to the project for specific assistance. At Rockhurst and Iowa Lakes, however, this method of needs assessment is relied on almost entirely.

Once the initial needs assessment is made, projects tend to keep track of the students' progress regardless of whether they receive project services or not. At Drake University, SSP students' needs are assessed on a continuing basis two weeks before midterm and semester exams. The project staff seeks to insure that students needing tutorial help are identified and encouraged to take advantage of the tutoring program. Luther College has a similar needs identification program, known as the System of Continuous Reporting, through which instructors notify the administration when students'

---

[1]UMKC, Wichita, CHESS, St. Louis, and Luther.

grades fall below a "C" at any point in the year. The SSP staff is notified when an SSP participant's name appears on a list. The Wichita State project follows up on its students' academic progress through midterm grade reports, and the staff contacts those in need of additional services.

One of the responsibilities of peer counselors is to identify various student problems, including poor academic performance during the school year. In the projects having peer counseling components, attempts are made to identify real or perceived problems informally and to seek help for the students before the problems become severe.

Tutoring

Tutoring programs are focal points of most of the Special Services Projects, both in terms of the degree of activity expended and numbers of students served. Table 16 provides an indication of the variety of services offered by the projects (shown as X) and by the institutions (shown as √), while Table 17 indicates numbers of students receiving various services at the time of the site visits. As Table 16 shows, all projects except Iowa Lakes provide tutoring; the Iowa Lakes project has hired a tutor but to date there have been no requests from the students for his services. In 5 of the 9 projects, tutoring is the most widely used component.

Tutoring services are provided for individuals requiring special assistance to succeed in a regular course in which they are enrolled. In 7 of the 9 projects, tutoring sessions are scheduled regularly; Hutchinson and Iowa Lakes are the exceptions. At Hutchinson, tutors have office hours, and students seek them out when they need help. The tutor at Iowa Lakes will make himself available when a student requests his help.

Tutoring schedules are established either by the project staff or by the tutor and student; the procedure varies among the institutions. At the CHESS, Rockhurst, and UMKC projects, the project

TABLE 16
Project Services and Benefits

	C H E S S										
	Drake	DMACC	Grand View	Iowa Lakes	Hutch-inson	Lu-ther	Rock-hurst	St. Louis	S.W. Mo.	UMKC	Wich-ita
Tutoring	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Remedial Classes	✓	✓		✓	X	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	X
Study Skills	✓			✓	X	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	
College Orient'n	X				X	✓			X		
Peer Counseling						X	X	X	X		X
Professional Counseling	X	X	X	✓	X	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X
Priority Registration						✓				X	
Priority Finan-cial aid						✓		X		X	X
Special Retention Consideration	X	X	X			✓		X		X	X
Personal, Family Aid	X	X	X		X	X		X		X	X
Services for Handicapped	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X

X = Service provided by Special Services Project or arranged specifically for project participants.

✓ = Service available through institution for all students.

TABLE 17
Project Services by Level of Use
(no. of participants)

	Total No. Participants	Participants Receiving:					
		Tutoring	Remedial Classes	Peer Counseling	Professional Counseling	Aid to Handicapped	College Orientation
CHESS	380	58	76	---	219	21	292
Iowa Lakes	24	0	8	---	1	0	---
Hutchinson	175	53	37	---	85	4	133
Luther	101	27	9	---	N/A*	2	---
Rockhurst	85	84	9	N/A*	N/A*	3	---
St. Louis U.	216	132	15	96	216	1	---
SMSU	63	45	10	55	---	18	---
UMKC	206	93	31	---	15	9	---
Wichita State	265	115	37	150	N/A*	4	---

* Information not available.

staffs work out the schedules for tutoring sessions and notify tutors and students of the appointed times and places. This procedure was adopted to maintain central control over all tutoring schedules and to insure a sufficient number of sessions. At Luther, St. Louis, SMSU, and Wichita the tutors and students jointly arrange schedules for tutoring sessions. The projects encourage regular delivery of tutoring services, although they aiso make them available on an emergency basis--before exams or during particularly difficult sections of courses.

Counseling

As Table 16 indicates, participants in all nine projects have access to professional counseling services, from either the project staffs or the institutions' resources. Three of the projects are staffed with counselors. St. Louis has a full-time professional counselor, and the Hutchinson project employs two counselors on a part-time basis. At the UMKC project a psychologist from the University's Counseling Center works at the project site two days a week, and a counseling graduate student is on duty there part-time. Also, the tutoring coordinator at Rockhurst has counseling credentials, and she counsels students informally when there is a need; her main functions, however, are administering and supervising the tutoring and peer counseling programs. In the projects without staff counselors, the project directors, assistant directors, and staff professionals offer some form of counseling to participants. All of the institutions have personnel and programs available for delivering academic, personal, and career counseling services to students, including Special Services participants.

Counseling provided directly by Special Services is designed to supplement what the institutions provide and fill gaps in the institution-provided services and delivery systems. Academic counseling, for example, is typically provided by the institutions through faculty advising programs organized under the academic advising services and their usefulness to students is highly variable, depending on the adviser's interest, student needs, frequency

of adviser-student contact, and other factors. In some instances, academic advising consists mainly of a perfunctory approval of the student's class schedule each semester. When this is the case, the SSP staff attempts to fill the gap and offer a more personalized academic counseling service, particularly to insure that students are enrolled in courses appropriate for them and that their course loads are suitable for their abilities. The St. Louis University SSP staff provides academic counseling to all participants at least once, during their initial semester at the school, and more often if needed. In the other projects, academic counseling is provided by the project staffs on an as-needed basis, when problems become apparent or--in the case of UMKC--for specific individuals who have a tendency to need special help from the staff each semester.

Personal counseling takes a variety of forms among projects and even within projects. It is formal in some instances and informal in others. Sometimes it is help for overcoming a chronic emotional problem; sometimes, help for dealing with a temporary crisis; and sometimes, moral support to get through the day. At several projects the staff has made an effort to generate frequent student contact and encourage use of the project facility as a drop-in center. This effort has been particularly successful at Drake, Hutchinson, UMKC, St. Louis, and Wichita. At these sites, it is difficult to determine where casual conversation ends and "counseling" begins, since the casual contact is viewed by the staff as being in itself purposeful and supportive.

Iowa Lakes and SMSU are notably lacking in effective staff counseling support and are not assuming the friendly-gathering-place role that most other projects do. While the project directors call all students in for counseling, the sessions appear to be somewhat routine, and consist mainly of staff reminders of their availability, and assurances that help is available if needed. There was no evidence that students initiate contact with these staff members or seek them out for conversation or help.

Personal counseling at Rockhurst assumes a comparatively sophisticated form, both in the project and in the institution's Counseling Center. The tutoring coordinator has professional counseling training; she counsels some students informally and helps solve personal and family problems. She also refers students to the college Counseling Center which offers individual therapy services and personal growth counseling, using techniques such as transactional analysis, reality therapy, and sensitivity group sessions.

Career counseling is an important concept of the national program, although it has a fairly low priority among identifiable service offerings in most projects, with the exception of those at Hutchinson and St. Louis. The Hutchinson project provides a career guidance program, using Vocational Exploratory Group kits, which include interest inventories and descriptive materials to help students define focal interests. Defining career goals is also an important feature of the overall program at St. Louis, although the techniques are somewhat less formalized than at Hutchinson. At the St. Louis project, career goal identification underlies much of the effort devoted to personal and academic counseling, which is provided on a regular basis to all SSP participants.

In the other projects, except for Iowa Lakes and SMSU, the project staffs report that they make it a point to assist students in clarifying their goals and plans at some early point during their contacts with each student. Students who appear to require special help are usually referred to career counseling centers on the campuses.

There is some doubt as to the effectiveness of referrals to the institutions' counseling centers and programs. While these programs appear to be well-conceived and comprehensive, there is doubt as to how many Special Services students are actually served. Individual referral arrangements apparently are not formalized, and counselors are usually not aware of whether students they

counsel are SSP participants. Thus, the records in counseling centers do not indicate numbers of SSP students served, and SSP referrals are usually not recorded in the project offices. Consequently, there is no way of measuring service usage and service effectiveness. Some SSP directors and college counselors suspect that many students fail to follow up on the referrals, due either to lack of motivation or reluctance to seek help from unfamiliar sources. Some of the project directors sense also that students may fail to get counseling, particularly personal counseling, because of the stigma attached to it.

Recognizing the futility of sending students to services, some of the projects attempt to bring services to students. CHESS, Wichita, St. Louis, and Hutchinson counseling services are offered by the project staffs. The UMKC project has arrangements with the Couseling Center there to "deliver" personal counseling at the project offices. Plans are also being made in conjunction with the UMKC Career Counseling Office to bring career-selection counseling to the SSP through a series of career information presentations.

Supplementing the professional counseling services made available to SSP students through the projects and the institutions, four of the projects have peer counseling components. In three of these cases, peer counseling represents the focal emphasis of the project, reaching more students than do the tutoring services. Peer counseling is a "big brother/sister" type of program in which counselors inform students of campus services and activities and attempt in a friendly way to identify and help solve minor problems. Another purpose of the contacts is to insure that appropriate help is obtained for students encountering more serious problems and that students do not simply disappear from campus when they become discouraged.

Peer counselors generally are undergraduate students assigned to keep in regular contact with the SSP participants, particularly

the freshmen, transfer students, and others unfamiliar with the institution. The stated purposes of peer counseling vary, but the approaches and procedures are similar. In some projects--such as those at Rockhurst and St. Louis University--peer counseling has the dual purpose of orienting students to campus services and motivating students to learn--to attend classes and tutoring sessions, do assigned outside study, and adopt appropriate attitudes toward scholarship. In other projects (for example, Wichita State and SMSU), peer counseling programs were designed to help students with social as well as academic adjustment.

Remedial Classes

Four of the projects offer remedial classes directly, and four refer students to institution-sponsored remedial programs. Of the four offering remedial classes directly, two (Rockhurst and UMKC) offer only summer programs geared to the academically deficient high school graduate. These courses, offered in conjunction with Upward Bound, provide instruction in English, math, biology, and study skills. The classes are staffed with professionals experienced in teaching the disadvantaged. Class sizes are small, ranging from 10 to 15 students, and teacher aides and tutors are available for additional assistance. During the regular school year, remedial classes or individual instruction are available through learning centers and special academic tutoring programs at Rockhurst and UMKC.

The Hutchinson and St. Louis projects offer year-round remedial classes in reading and study skills. The Hutchinson project employs two reading specialists, one working full-time, the other part-time. The St. Louis SSP has one full-time reading teacher on staff.

Services to the Handicapped

Tutoring, counseling, and other project services are available to physically as well as academically handicapped students. Seven of the projects enroll physically handicapped students and

have developed services for them on an *ad hoc* basis. UMKC provides typing services; the Luther College project provides readers and tape recordings of lectures for the blind students; and at Drake, there are readers for blind students, interpreters for the deaf, and escorts for wheelchair-bound students. At SMSU, student aides (peer counselors) contact the 18 handicapped students regularly and furnish study and escort assistance as needed. At Wichita State, typing and reading services are given handicapped students; special learning aids are obtained as needed. The assistant project director at Wichita State is a Braille translator, and does much of the work with the blind participants who enroll there. At Rockhurst, lectures are taped for blind students, and other special learning materials and personal assistance are given as needed. Having diverse kinds of disabilities and differing kinds of needs, handicapped students are thus given a variety of services. To serve any one handicapped individual entails tailor-making a program of services for his specific kind and level of need. The projects are not, of course, in a position to meet all needs of all their handicapped participants. However, the variety of services approach allows the projects to fill some needs and gives them a certain flexibility in their responses to the problems of their handicapped populations.

Other Benefits and Services

In addition to the components and services described in the preceding sections, other benefits accrue to participants as a result of arrangements between some projects and institutions. At three schools--UMKC, St. Louis, and Wichita--Special Services students receive priority consideration in the financial aid packaging process. At these schools and the three CHESS schools, special consideration in academic retention is given SSP participants. At UMKC, Special Services students have priority registration privileges which assure them entrance to courses and sections of courses that are most suitable for them. At Luther College, all high-risk

students,[1] including SSP participants, have priority registration, financial aid, and retention consideration.

College orientation programs are offered by three projects. All institutions provide some type of student orientation, but in some instances these are viewed by SSP staff to be unsuited to the needs of Special Services students. Drake University, for example, charges a fee for its orientation program. The Drake project offers a group orientation on the campus for Special Services students who cannot afford the fee. Hutchinson and SMSU projects provide orientation through the peer counseling components; at Hutchinson, "orientation" begins as correspondence between peer counselors and freshmen-to-be prior to the beginning of the fall term. Projects providing summer college preparation activities--St. Louis, Rockhurst, and UMKC--offer informal orientation in conjunction with these programs.

In some of the projects, Special Services students receive countless other benefits and services too numerous to list and apparently too informal for the project staff to enumerate. These "services" are generally in the form of assistance in solving the personal, financial, family, and academic problems that invariably confront many students and hamper their ability to achieve. Several projects, moreover, function as drop-in centers where students congregate for conversation with the staff and other participants. This function is viewed as a major benefit by staffs of these projects, and they have made special attempts to encourage this, particularly at UMKC, St. Louis, and Wichita State. The project staffs share the philosophy that continuing personal support is a vital factor in motivation and success in learning, and that their role in providing this support is equally as important as the more tangible project services.

---

[1]Luther College classifies students as "high-risk" on the basis of high school performance and scores on standardized (ACT and SAT) test scores.

Project Assessment of Services

With the exception of Iowa Lakes, which has not yet instituted services, all of the projects have developed methods of assessing the quality of their tutoring services. Table 18 lists assessment methods used by each project. Six projects rely exclusively on student scholastic progress to indicate the quality of tutoring. Student progress is typically assessed by reviewing midterm and semester grades, faculty reports, or evaluative reports prepared by tutors. The Luther College project staff gets feedback during weekly tutor-staff meetings and student progress is measured empirically through the college's assessment program for all high-risk students. The CHESS staff has attempted to do impact studies but had difficulty designing and conducting these.

There is not a substantial amount of activity in performance assessment--i.e., assessment of the service techniques and procedures. At St. Louis University, tutoring supervisors observe tutoring sessions as part of the assessment effort, and at three other projects the tutees are surveyed regularly to gauge their feelings about the usefulness of tutoring.

Of the four projects having peer counseling components, Rockhurst has the only comprehensive system, for assessing this activity. Rockhurst's assessment system incorporates a combination of peer counselor reports, student surveys, and staff meetings. At St. Louis and Wichita, assessment information is gained informally during staff meetings with the peer counselors. The SMSU project has not undertaken procedures for assessing the peer counseling component there.

In the projects offering remedial and compensatory instruction, attempts are made to measure student progress by means of standardized tests or progress measurements built into the curricula. Like the tutoring and peer counseling components, the remedial classes are not subjected to formal performance assessments. Generally, the instructional programs are reviewed and revised if necessary in the light of students' progress.

TABLE 18
Frequency of Assessment of Services
by Assessment Method Used

METHOD	Drake	DMACC	GV	ILCC N/A	Hutch-inson	Luther	Rock-hurst	SMSU	SLU	UMKC	WSU
Assess Student Program											
Review grades						Contin-uing	1/sem.		2/sem.	2/sem.	2/sem.
Tutor reports	2/mo.	weekly	2/mo.		1/mo.		2/mo.	1/mo.	1/wk.		2/mo.
Faculty reports								3/sem.	2/sem.		
5-year follow-up	X										
Compare grades in tutored and non-tutored courses	X										
Tutor-staff meetings						Weekly					
Assess Tutor Performance											
Obsrv'n by Supervisor									X		
Student survey					1/mo.		2/mo.				2/mo.
Peer Counselor Performance											
Student survey							2/mo.				
Peer Counselor survey							1/week				
Staff Meetings							X		X		X

Assessment is an area in which the projects are somewhat deficient, and the project staffs are interested in overcoming this. Several expressed the view that a self-assessment system would be a valuable tool for identifying areas where improvement in services is needed. At the Drake and Rockhurst projects, attempts have been made to develop such systems, but the staffs at both projects are not entirely satisfied with the procedures as yet.

Included among the assessment instruments for this evaluation study were a number of project performance indicators--designed to measure the quality of services. These measures focused on the adequacy of service delivery, techniques, facilities, and instructor qualifications. A survey of the students' perceptions was not included, but it is recommended for future assessment undertakings since it could yield feedback to projects on the value of services to the participants.

None of the projects attempt to assess counseling services, except in a very informal way. Where counseling is offered directly by the projects, assessment of the service is based on resolution of the problem for which the student is being counseled. When a problem is resolved, the counseling effort is viewed as being successful. Project staffs and this contractor as well were hampered in assessing quality of counseling, however, since there are no records of the counseling services and outcomes. Assessing counseling services provided SSP participants by the institutions is an even greater problem because of lack of records and followup on referrals. Student surveys could be of value in measuring the usage and usefulness of counseling services, whether project or institution-provided.

IV

INNOVATIVE AND EXEMPLARY ACTIVITIES

The variability among Special Services Projects (SSPs) is impressive. They have, for the most part, adapted to the specific needs of their target groups and the character of their surroundings. A happy outcome of this strong problem-solving orientation is that many of the projects have developed innovative approaches for achieving their objectives. Coupled with the diversity of circumstances under which the projects operate, there have resulted a number of highly effective and unique ways of doing program business. This chapter discusses these innovations under the headings of Services, Administrative Procedures, and Working Relationships with the Institutions. An analytic summary at the chapter's conclusion discusses some relationships observed among innovation and project-institutional relationships.

SERVICES

The tutoring component of the Special Services Program illustrates well the individuality of the projects studied. At most of the institutions, the tutors are drawn from the ranks of academically successful upperclassmen who are recommended by the instructors of the courses for which they tutor. At two of the schools in the Iowa consortium, however, there are no upperclassmen (Des Moines Area Community College and Grandview); the third member of the consortium, Drake University, is called upon to provide some of the tutors to these neighboring two-year colleges. At Southwest Missouri State University (SMSU) the tutors are full-time faculty members who have a particular interest in tutoring and/or the learning process and, at the University of Missouri at Kansas City (UMKC), graduate students are employed as tutors. In contrast, St. Louis University chooses tutors from among its own academically successful

(and departmentally recommended) Special Services Program participants, with the intent of providing effective models along with tutoring assistance to those who are having a difficult time in school. The St. Louis tutors receive compensation through the work/study program.

While almost all of the projects studied have tutoring by appointment, the Hutchinson Community Junior College project provides tutoring on a full-time unscheduled basis. The SSP tutors man the institution's learning center and are, thus, available for drop-in assistance. They are also the tutoring resource for all students at the college as well as anyone in the community, such as high school students, who might desire tutoring. Special Services students are given priority attention, but any unfilled tutor time is available for any Hutchinson student or community member. Tutoring for non-SSP participants is paid for by the individual tutees.

At institutions where tutoring is done by appointment, there is a wide range of responses to the problem of no-shows. In some instances, missed appointments are considered simply a feature of the syndrome which characterizes participants in Special Services Projects, and it is felt that Special Services should work toward altering the syndrome, rather than punish it. In other cases, the making and keeping of appointments is considered a matter of some seriousness. At St. Louis University, a student makes a contract for a certain number of hours of tutoring per week. At UMKC, students are automatically dropped from tutoring if they miss an appointment without prior notification.

Training for the tutors is offered in several of the projects. At Rockhurst College, in-service training sessions are held approximately every two weeks in which tutors learn new instructional and counseling techniques, discuss mutual concerns, and share ideas. St. Louis University tutors meet with the project's associate director to discuss problems and responses and to become acquainted

with new approaches. At Hutchinson, tutors have one general information session and receive information sheets on teaching techniques and on study skills throughout the year.

The range of counseling services made available to Special Service Program participants is wide. In some programs, counseling is simply available as needed, provided by one or more of the project staff members or through referral to the school's counseling service. In others, such as Drake and St. Louis, the as-needed resource is supplemented by required meetings of each Special Services student with a counselor. At Drake this takes place once a year for transcript evaluation; at St. Louis, twice a semester, once for personal counseling, once for academic counseling.

At four of the institutions, peer counseling has been developed into a major feature of the program. St. Louis' peer counselors are Special Services students who have applied through work/study. Each peer counselor is assigned eight students, and each of these students is contacted three times a week--once in person and twice by phone. The counselors have a seminar every other week with the project's counselor and there is a monthly meeting of all peer counselors and freshman program participants. Peer counselors receive one credit hour from the department of education for their counseling work. At Wichita State University, new Special Services students are assigned "Student Development Advisors" (SDAs) who contact them once a week and provide assistance in a wide variety of areas. The SDAs are upperclassmen, recruited as much as possible from among students like those who are being advised, and act as success models for the newcomers. All of the SDAs meet together once a week.

UMKC offers a unique approach to combatting the stigma some program participants seem to feel is associated with "seeing a shrink." A counseling center psychologist spends two days a week at the Special Services offices, and an intern is available on a part-time basis.

Their distant, professional roles are shed in this setting. They are known by their first names and few, if any, of the students realize the psychologists are not program staff members or tutors.

In addition to counselors and tutors, other types of support personnel are provided by some of the projects. At all three schools in the Iowa consortium notetakers, readers, researchers, typists and signers (for deaf students) are employed to assist handicapped students. The Hutchinson program hires lab aides, student assistants who give special help to students during lab sections of math and science courses. At SMSU a group of student aides is available to assist students in the program; these aides have the entire responsibility for providing support to the handicapped students. Each aide has a group of 6 to 8 students he contacts weekly. They also visit program participants at home prior to the students' arrival at the university. The aides are then on hand to help orient their students when they arrive on campus and they continue to maintain close regular contact throughout the school year.

Services which help to prepare students for university life are provided for incoming Special Services students by a few of the programs. Drake University offers a 1 1/2 day orientation that includes a description of the services offered by the SSP, introduction of the staff, a tour of the campus, and social activities. The UMKC and Rockhurst projects, in conjunction with Upward Bound, conduct eight-week summer courses for incoming Special Services students in reading, English, math and biology. St. Louis University also offers a summer basic-skills class which some entering Special Services students are required to attend and others may elect.

Where Learning Centers are in existence, the Special Services Projects cooperate closely with them, referring students for help in a variety of study skill and basic learning areas. In addition, certain programs sponsor special courses or seminars of their own.

Hutchinson has a remedial reading and study skills course which is one-to-one, individually tailored for each student and earns the student one point of credit.

Finally, many of the Special Services Projects offered participants minor but noteworthy services also deserve mention here. The Wichita project makes available to its participants a text book library and text book loan program, a term paper typing service, and free passes to campus activities. It also posts a daily newsheet concerning current events and items to the students. The Hutchinson project produces a monthly newsletter, a weekly radio program, and informational displays in the library. Library books and magazines of special interest are also made available to the Hutchinson participants. At Luther College the project has arranged for enrollees in the Rhetoric 60 course--who are upperclass teaching majors in English--to be paired with high-risk freshmen, in order to lend assistance with writing assignments in all subjects. This relationship is continued throughout the semester, enabling the upperclassmen to coach their SSP partners' in writing skills on a variety of assignments.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

The staffing patterns of all the projects might be summed up as lean and functional. Each position seems to entail a set of well defined responsibilities. Staff members appear to be chosen with an eye to special skills--e.g., tutoring, counseling--and/or warmth and supportiveness, along with general capability. In some instances there is a quite purposive effort to establish the staff as success models for the project's participants.

One of the Special Services Projects is unique in that it is administered through a consortium, representing two two-year colleges and Drake University in Iowa. The consortium, which is the project grantee, is constituted of two representatives from the higher

administrative levels at each of the three schools. Each school has its own distinctive project and its own director--hired by the institution but responsible to the Special Services director, who is hired by the consortium.

Two projects operate with the counsel of a policy advisory committee. Wichita's Advisory Council meets once or twice yearly. The project's director is currently involved in trying to strengthen representation from poverty neighborhoods on this body. Hutchinson Junior College keeps abreast of the needs of the community members through two local Advisory Committees--one for the Black community and one for the Mexican-American community. There is also an overall Special Services Advisory Board for the Hutchinson program.

Recruitment of students into the SSP programs involves as a usual first step the identification of eligible students. The projects seem routinely to acquire lists of potential participants from Financial Aid, Admissions, and Rehabilitation offices on their campuses. At Drake, in addition to these sources, the project requests and receives listings from applications for fee waivers, high school transcripts, SAT or PSAT scores, and is allowed to examine parent confidential financial statements.

The methods of contacting eligible students, once they are enrolled, vary considerably among programs. At Iowa Lakes the students' names are listed in the daily notices with a request to see the project director. At Luther College, the students are invited to a get-acquainted social; at SMSU all eligible individuals are informed of the project's services and resources in personal interviews. Rockhurst College makes a special effort to attract low-income and academically needy students to the project through extensive campus advertising and informational campaigns. It does not actively recruit any eligible individual, however, feeling that, in a small school, such individuals may feel stigmatized by identification with the program.

Several of the projects initiate recruitment efforts at the pre-enrollment stage. Hutchinson obtains referrals directly through the high schools and the Talent Search Program. Wichita disseminates information on the SSP through churches, high schools, and Community Action Programs, and publicizes its program to local business and civic organizations. Each year a slide show is developed to present the project's accomplishments. UMKC sends program representatives to high schools and community colleges to describe the project's services. Interested potentially eligible students are then visited in their homes by these representatives to acquaint parents with the project and to initiate the paperwork required for admission and financial aid. At St. Louis University, eligible students are enrolled directly into Special Services as part of the admissions procedure.

Once participants have begun making use of project services, most projects make some effort to assess the usefulness of the services to the students. Tutoring receives the greatest emphasis in this regard. At Drake, for example, two weeks prior to mid-term and end-of-term professors of students being tutored are asked to report on students' progress. Ninety percent of the professors are said to cooperate in this assessment effort, aimed at getting additional tutoring assistance to those who need it. St. Louis' associate director often drops in on tutoring sessions to gain first-hand feedback. At Hutchinson, tutors file reports on all tutoring sessions and both tutors and tutees evaluate the service once a month. Evaluations of the tutoring service are sought from Wichita tutees twice a term. At Rockhurst, tutoring and counseling services are assessed bi-weekly by staff and students.

With a broader focus, two of the Iowa consortium schools, Drake and DMACC, have attempted overall assessments of the success of their Special Services Projects. And, at Luther College, a System of Continuous Reporting notifies the Special Services staff when its participants are doing less than "C" work. A course of corrective

action is then charted and follow-up is undertaken to see if the action was effective.

Finally, it is of interest to note some of the rather striking differences encountered among the projects in what might be called "administrative attitude." At issue is whether the students ought to decide when they are in need of some sort of assistance or whether the program ought to see that they get the services they apparently require. Although some projects occupy the middle of the road on this issue, aiming to be subtly helpful, others opt for very different positions. At Drake, for example, it is the program philosophy that if a student does not want help, even if he obviously needs it, he must be allowed to make his own decision. It is also the practice of that project to attempt to get upperclassmen to take responsibility for themselves; tutors are furnished to this group only when critically needed. It is Rockhurst's approach as well to allow the student to identify his own need for services.

In contrast, Wichita assigns its entering students "big brother" student development advisers who will provide assistance with problems ranging from personal to logistical to academic. And, at St. Louis, students are enrolled directly into the SSP program; it is assumed that, as high risk students, they will require the supportive services the program offers.

These differences in administrative attitude are perhaps best accounted for as institutional differences rather than project differences. In other words, the SSP group is not singled out for special treatment; it is more likely that a given institution feels that all its students ought to be treated in a "hands off" or, alternatively, "supportive" manner and the project falls in step with these approaches.

WORKING RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE INSTITUTIONS

The Special Services Projects relate to their host institutions through cross referrals: students who are eligible for Special

Services are referred there from a variety of campus sources (for example, the Financial Aid and the Rehabilitation Offices). The projects, in turn, refer their participants to institutional resources. In addition, where there are Learning Centers, the SSPs almost invariably make use of them.

Beyond this basic relationship with the institution, the projects are linked to their colleges in a variety of ways. The admission of students likely to qualify for Special Services assistance is directly influenced by the SSP at three of the institutions. At Luther and Rockhurst, the project directors serve on the Admissions Committee; Rockhurst's director sits on the Financial Aids Committee as well. These positions give the directors some degree of say-so on students admitted and receiving financial support. At St. Louis, decisions regarding the admission of Special Services-eligible students are made jointly by the project director and the admissions officer; similarly, financial aid awards to these students are made as joint decisions with the director. At Wichita, UMKC, Drake and DMACC, the institutions have generally liberalized their admissions policies, allowing more student of the type that Special Services Programs serve, to enter. In the Iowa consortium schools, Special Services students from the two-year colleges are now automatically admitted to Drake when they wish to transfer.

Once admitted, the degree of specific institutional services and support offered especially to SSP students varies from none to a great deal. Retention policies at several of the institutions have been liberalized. Both St. Louis and Rockhurst have extended the length of time a student may remain on probation. Wichita allows these students to take credit/no credit rather than letter grades during their first semester. Hutchinson plans to eliminate "F" grades completely and allow withdrawal from classes to take place at any time during the semester. At Drake, Special Services

students may get probation instead of suspension, and "in progress" instead of an "incomplete."

Curriculum changes have been instituted at some schools, toward the end of gearing lower division departmental offerings to the needs of Special Services students. In some instances this has meant adding "prep" courses, in others, slowing down the pace at which material is covered, and in still others, developing self-paced courses. UMKC, Luther, and St. Louis are examples of schools which have instituted such changes.

Additional financial support for the project and its students has been arranged at some of the institutions. At Hutchinson, UMKC, and Drake, SSP students are given priority call on the schools' financial aid resources. Special scholarship funds have been established at Wichita, UMKC and Drake; and, at Des Moines Area Community College, the student bookstore may begin donating 10 percent of its profits to the consortium for operation of the Special Services Project. The institution providing the greatest financial support to its Special Services population is clearly St. Louis University, which makes available a housing grant (enabling program participants to obtain residence in an environment conducive to academic success), $160,000 yearly in scholarships, and free summer school for freshmen and sophomores needing to make up academic deficiencies.

In an interesting turnabout on the theme of service extension to SSP students, at Hutchinson College the Special Services staff is the coordinator for all tutoring done on campus; in fact, its tutoring services are offered to the high schools and the community as well. This project also makes its special career guidance program available to the entire college community.

In some instances the host institution offers services or support to the SSP staffs, thus supporting the students indirectly. At Luther, for example, the school computes Predicted Grade Point Averages for each entering student. These scores are useful both for identifying

high-risk students and for assessing the effectiveness of the Special Services Project in serving them. Luther College also operates a System of Continuous Reporting, which routinely identifies students having academic difficulties. At Rockhurst, the faculty and Counseling Center staffs provide training to the project's peer counselors and tutors.

In two instances, the projects share resources with other components of the institution. The Rockhurst project shares facilities and staff with the Learning Center, although SSP is not organizationally a part of the Center. At Wichita and UMKC, the Upward Bound programs work closely with the SSPs, and the two programs share staffs during the summer session.

Finally, at Wichita State University and at the University of Missouri at Kansas City, the projects are uniquely linked with their institutions in that their directors (the TRIO director in the case of UMKC) hold University appointments. At Wichita, the director is an assistant dean of students; at UMKC the TRIO director is an assistant dean of Arts and Sciences.

As can be seen from the foregoing examples, several of the projects have developed close working ties with their host institutions. To the degree that these ties have developed in any given case, the institution can be said to have demonstrated its commitment to the Special Services concept and to the project's client group. The variety of forms this commitment has taken attests again to the individuality of character the Special Services Programs have achieved. This individuality appears to result both from adaptation to the host institution and from the translation of innovative ideas into workable practices for serving their respective target groups.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The evidence of this study suggests that a strong relationship exists between the degree of institutional commitment and extent

of innovation observed in Special Services Projects. Where institutional commitment to the projects is highest, the greatest degree of innovation was observed. At St. Louis University, UMKC, and Wichita State--where commitment is high--the Special Services Projects are overall the most innovative in the sample, particularly with respect to the *nature* of services they offer. The summer remedial and orientation components at the three schools and the textbook and current events programs at Wichita illustrate the innovations in services these projects have developed in response to participant needs.

Projects enjoying a high institutional commitment also provide a wider range of services than do the others. There is a tendency at these projects to provide a full package of services directly rather than to rely on referrals to institutional services. Service delivery is more direct since the projects are staffed or have on-site consultants to offer a comprehensive range of counseling, orientation, and remediation services. Counseling services at Drake, St. Louis, and Wichita, for example, are provided directly by SSP staff professionals, and by on-site consultants at UMKC. The summer orientation programs also exemplify the tendency of projects in highly committed schools to deliver services directly. While it may appear that these projects are duplicating services offered by the institutions, these projects have developed services of their own because the institutional services were unsuitable in some respects for the SSP participants. Drake University's orientation program, for instance, is too expensive for low-income SSP participants; as a result, the Special Services Project developed its own participant orientation. And, at UMKC, the counseling delivery system was brought into the project after it became evident that SSP students were failing to use "outside" counseling services.

The completeness of the service offerings at these projects may be both a cause and a result of the independence which also

characterizes the projects at "highly" committed schools. Their independence may have evolved as a result of continuing innovation and addition of services over the years. On the other hand, the innovations may be results of independence and autonomy. Whatever the case, it is clear the project independence, as well as institutional commitment, bears a relationship to level of innovation.

Hutchinson, Luther, and Rockhurst Colleges are institutions that have developed innovative and exemplary programs for serving the academically high-risk student. Special Services Projects are integral parts of these efforts; institutional commitment is focused more on the overall efforts on behalf of disadvantaged students than on the SSPs per se. And, innovation is more evident at the institutional than the project level. Within the Special Services Projects themselves innovations are minor. Hutchinson's career counseling component is innovative, although it is an institutional program since it serves the entire student body. The Rockhurst project's training program is innovative and exemplary even though it is not a major service offering. The Luther College needs assessment system and faculty reporting system are innovative, but these are *institutional* rather than *project* innovations. Apparently, where there is already substantial institutional innovation in serving academically deficient students, there is less room or necessity for Special Services Projects to innovate. Instead, the projects become parts of larger innovative efforts.

Independence and autonomy are not characterized in the Rockhurst, Luther, and Hutchinson projects. At these small institutions which have exemplary programs for high-risk students there appears to be much more coordination between project and institutional services. Apparently the project staffs feel that many institutional services are appropriate for SSP participants, and they see little need to use their resources to duplicate these. Where services have not been approprate, these projects have stepped in to fill the gap,

as in the case of the Hutchinson project's career counseling and remediation components.

Where institutional commitment is low--at Iowa Lakes and SMSU--there are few innovations within the projects or the institutions that are benefiting SSP participants. The scope of direct project services is very narrow, and is limited to tutoring and peer counseling. Quite possibly, the limited project resources and lack of institutional support are factors that have precluded project innovation at institutions lacking commitment to the project.

V

PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS AND ENROLLMENT

If one were to select a *typical* Special Services participant, that participant would likely be a Black female student from a low-income family in her freshman year of college. Participants with these characteristics outnumber others in the sample of projects visited, as indicated in Table 19. However, as the table also indicates, the participant groups vary substantially from project to project, in ethnic composition, academic status, and proportion who are physically handicapped. At some projects, the participant group is predominantly male; at others, female. This chapter describes the various target groups served by the projects, and discusses the variations in service emphasis, enrollment practices, and other project features which appear to define the projects' target populations.

PARTICIPANT ELIGIBILITY

According to Federal program regulations, Special Services Projects must limit their services to students who meet specified maximum income criteria, are physically handicapped, or have limited English-speaking ability. Statistics provided to the evaluators by the staffs of the nine sample projects indicate that officially enrolled students meet these criteria in most cases. The statistics from all except two projects--Rockhurst and UMKC--show all official enrollees meeting criteria. At Rockhurst, the project policy is to accept any student for tutoring in order to avoid stigmatizing the project on this small campus.[1] UMKC serves a group of 23 Upward Bound students and veterans whose incomes are above the

[1]The participants' income levels at Rockhurst have been inaccessible; the information is kept by the Financial Aids Office and was in storage during the site visit, while the office staff moved to different quarters.

TABLE 19
Selected Characteristics of SSP Participants
(Proportion of Total Enrollment)

	CHESS											
	Drake	DMACC	Grand View	Iowa Lakes	Hutch-inson	Lu-ther	Rock-hurst	St. Louis	S.W. Mo.	UMKC	Wich-ita	TOTALS
Total Participants	292	56	58	24	175	101	85	216	63	206	265	1541
Ethnicity:												
Spanish	.10	---	---	---	.25	---	---	---	---	.01	.10	.07
Other White	.13	.82	.41	.58	.55	.73	.54	.01	.86	.05	.12	.28
Black	.69	.14	.59	.41	.18	.26	.39	.99	.13	.92	.71	.61
American Indian	.01	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.03	.01
Oriental	---	---	---	---	---	.02	.01	---	.01	.01	.01	.01
Other	.08	.04	---	---	.02	---	.06	---	---	.01	.02	.03
TOTAL	1.01[a]	1.00	.100	.99[a]	1.00	1.01[a]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	.99[a]	1.01[a]
Academic Status:												
Freshmen	.33	.64	.62	.71	.76	.35	.46	.34	.71	.42	.48	.47
Sophomores	.20	.36	.33	.29	.24	.24	.14	.27	.17	.17	.20	.22
Upperclassmen	.45	---	.05	---	---	.42	.36	.39	.11	.36	.25	.28
Graduate Students	.02	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.04	.05	.02
Other	---	---	---	---	---	---	.02	---	---	---	.03	.01
TOTAL	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.01[a]	.98[a]	1.00	.99[a]	.99[a]	1.01[a]	1.00

(Continued on next page)

TABLE 19 (Cont.)
Selected Characteristics of SSP Participants
(Proportion of Total Enrollment)

	CHESS			Iowa Lakes	Hutchinson	Luther	Rockhurst	St. Louis	S.W. Mo.	UMKC	Wichita	TOTALS
	Drake	DMACC	Grand View									
Sex:												
Male	.45	.57	.66	.67	.59	.44	.44	.22	.43	.35	.42	.43
Female	.55	.43	.34	.33	.41	.57	.55	.78	.57	.65	.58	.57
TOTAL	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.01[a]	.99[a]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Eligibility Category:												
Low-Income	.93	.86	.86	.91	1.00	.98	N/A[c]	.99	.71	.84	.98	.93
Handicapped	.07	.11	.14	.08	.02	.02	.04	.01	.29	.04	.02	.05
Other	---	.04	---	---	---	---	N/A[c]	---	---	.12	---	.02
TOTAL	1.00	1.01	1.00	.99[a]	1.02[b]	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

(Continued on next page)

TABLE 19 (Cont.)
Selected Characteristics of SSP Participants
(Proportion of Total Enrollment)

	CHESS											
	Drake	DMACC	Grand View	Iowa Lakes	Hutch-inson	Lu-ther	Rock-hurst	St. Louis	S.W. Mo.	UMKC	Wich-ita	TOTALS
Length of Enrollment:			CHESS									
< 1 Semester			.20	---	---	---	---	.33	.87	.43	.53	.28
1 Semester			.07	.79	.76	.35	.65	.01	---	.23	.18	.24
2 Semesters			.13	---	---	---	.04	.26	.06	---	.13	.10
3 Semesters			.10	.21	.24	.24	.19	.01	.05	.34[d]	.05	.14
4 Semesters			.17	---	---	---	.09	.23	.02	---	.03	.09
> 4 Semesters			.34	---	---	.42	.02	.16	---	---	.07	.16
TOTAL			1.01[a]	1.00	1.00	1.01[a]	.99[a]	1.00	1.00	1.00	.99[a]	1.01[a]

[a]Does not add to 1.00 due to rounding

[b]Adds to more than 1.00 due to duplication among categories

[c]N/A = Data not available

[d]Represents students enrolled 3 semesters or more

income guidelines. At least two other projects periodically serve students ineligible according to guidelines, although this is not reflected in their official enrollment statistics. The Wichita State project provides services when requested by nonenrolled students or in response to referrals from other campus offices. The staff is reluctant to turn down requests on the basis of ineligibility when services are obviously needed. The CHESS project serves 21 students who are, according to the project director, "eligible by legitimate criteria" other than low-income, handicap, or limited English-speaking ability.

Clearly, these nine Special Services Projects focus their "recruitment" efforts on the low-income student. More than 90 percent of all participants in the projects meet the OE income guidelines, and most of those who do not are reported by project staffs to be only slightly above these levels. Few physically handicapped students are enrolled; they comprise only five percent of the sample's participant populations. The numbers of non-English-speaking students are also very small, probably because of the small proportion of the population in the Midwest that is non-English-speaking. To the extent we can determine, of the 1,541 participants in the nine projects, only two are non-English-speaking.

PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS AND ENROLLMENT PRACTICES

The principal participant target group varies from project to project. In some cases, it is the low-income student; in some, the Black student; in still others, it is the academically deficient, or high-risk, student. The differences may be related to differences in recruiting practices, project image, and history.

In all projects in the sample, a large majority of enrollees meet the income criteria since the eligibility requirements are stringent and the projects attempt to conform with them. In some cases, income level is the only factor which delineates the target group. Projects at Iowa Lakes and SMSU, for example, use income

level as the only determinant of who receives SSP services. Income-eligible students are identified by the staffs from financial aids information and all are invited to participate in the projects. Most participants in these projects are White, although there is a sizable Black minority (41%) at Iowa Lakes and a small group of Black students (13%) participating at SMSU. A high proportion of the Iowa Lakes and SMSU participants are freshman (71% in each case), and are thus in their first year of the program. The Iowa Lakes project enrollment is predominantly male (67%); at SMSU, proportionately more females than males are enrolled. At SMSU and Iowa Lakes, personal characteristics of the participants other than income level seem to be due more to chance than to particular enrollment emphasis or recruitment practices.

The principal emphasis in three other projects--Hutchinson, Luther, and Rockhurst--is on compensatory education. Correspondingly, the recruitment procedures followed by these projects aim toward identifying and encouraging participation of students with academic deficiencies. Once this determination is made, consideration is given to the income criteria. Those meeting the criteria at Hutchinson and Luther are referred to SSP; at Rockhurst, students requesting SSP tutoring are served regardless of income if no other avenue of assistance on the campus seems appropriate. These projects serve an ethnically mixed participant group comprised mainly of Whites, with substantial proportions of minority group students. The Luther College project enrolls proportionately fewer minority students (28%) than either the Rockhurst (46%) or the Hutchinson (44%) projects. This may be due partially to differences in the general population makeup of the local areas; the population of rural Iowa contains proportionately fewer minority groups than either Kansas City, Missouri, or eastern Kansas. Another factor may be the Hutchinson and Rockhurst project associations with minority group programs and organizations. The Rockhurst project is directly linked with the school's Upward Bound project which enrolls a large number of Black students. The SSP project director and

assistant director serve Upward Bound in these same capacities. The Hutchinson project staff has several minority group affiliations; its two advisory councils represent the Black and the Mexican-American communities and the project is publicized in the community among minority organizations and service programs. On the other hand, such associations which may affect enrollment patterns are not evident at Luther College. This project enrolls students who are systematically identified as being (1) academically in need of services and (2) eligible for project services. There is no indication that any other factors are given priority or emphasized in the process of enrolling Luther College participants.

The CHESS project and those at St. Louis, Wichita State, and UMKC enroll participant groups that are predominantly Black. While the enrollment processes also emphasize income level and academic need, there is clearly an emphasis on attracting the minority student. More than 90 percent of the St. Louis and UMKC participants are Black; 81 percent at Wichita State are Black or Mexican-American and 70 percent of the Drake University project participants are Black or Mexican-American.

Predominance of Blacks and other ethnic minorities appears a natural outcome of the recruiting practices and sources at the large, urban institutions. Projects at UMKC, Wichita, and St. Louis are publicized in local inner-city high schools having high proportions of low-income students. In the inner areas of these large cities, the proportion of minority students is very high. The Wichita project, in addition, is publicized among local community and social action organizations which serve and involve low-income residents, and again, much of the audience of this publicity is Black. The CHESS projects identify eligible students from lists of low-income, handicapped, and *minority* group students enrolled at the institutions.

Other factors may account for the predominantly Black enrollment of these four projects. One factor is the image that the projects have developed over the years as programs for Black students. Several of the projects originated as minority group programs prior to receiving Federal OE funds and were established in the late 1960's to help meet the educational and social needs of the inner-city (i.e., Black) populations. Awareness of these needs and the institutional commitments to meet them apparently resulted, at least in part, from the racial unrest of that period and the Black communities' demands for greater educational opportunity. By the time these projects became part of the Federal Special Services Program, their image and character were already established. The officials of the institutions evidently see little reason to alter the character of these projects or image, since they continue to demonstrate the institutions' commitments to the minority communities.

ENROLLMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

Proportionately few handicapped students are receiving project services; there are 76 physically handicapped participants in the nine projects, comprising five percent of the total enrollment. This is much higher than the proportion of handicapped (1%) in the total enrollments of these schools. As Table 20 shows, only three projects--Luther, Rockhurst, and St. Louis--are serving a substantial proportion of the schools' handicapped populations. The project director of Iowa Lakes reported plans to contact the 41 handicapped students there during the spring semester. At the time of the site visits, however, only nine percent of the handicapped students were enrolled in Special Services at the eight institutions supplying data.

Examination of the statistics in Table 20 indicates that at the schools enrolling a very small number of handicapped students, most tend to enroll in SSPs. Fewer than five handicapped students are enrolled at the Luther, Rockhurst, and St. Louis University campuses;

TABLE 20
Selected Statistics on Enrollment
of Physically Handicapped

	Total School Enrollment	No. Handicapped Students in School	Percent of School Enrollment Handicapped	Percent of Handicapped Population in SSP	No. Handicapped SSP Students	Percent of SSP Enrollment Handicapped
CHESS						
Drake	5,000	N/A*	N/A	N/A	19	6.51
Grand View	900	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	13.79
DMACC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	10.71
Iowa Lakes	1,500	41	2.73	4.87	2	8.33
Hutchinson	2,400	60	2.5	6.67	4	2.28
Luther	1,850	2	0.11	100.00	2	1.98
Rockhurst	1,200	4	0.33	75.00	3	3.52
St. Louis	3,500	<5	>0.14	25.00-100.00	1	0.46
SMSU	12,000	150	1.25	12.00	18	28.57
UMKC	11,000	40	0.36	22.50	9	4.37
Wichita	15,000	200	1.33	2.00	4	1.51

*Data not available.

SOURCE: Admissions Offices of Grantee institutions.

nearly all are being served by the SSPs. The other institutions enroll substantial numbers of handicapped students--ranging from 40 to 200 on each campus--although proportionately few (from 2 to 23%) receive SSP services. There are several possible explanations for this. One is that institutions enrolling substantial numbers of handicapped students offer services and programs other than SSP that were specifically designed for this target group. In fact, handicapped students may have been attracted to these campuses because of their program offerings. Iowa Lakes offers a number of special programs for the handicapped, including a sheltered workshop, career orientation, and special learning aids and equipment, and houses a State Rehabilitation Office. At Hutchinson, veterans' programs and a technical learning center serve many handicapped students. Wichita State provides special study aids for the handicapped and furnishes personal services, such as readers for blind students. Southwest Missouri State provides personal services, to the handicapped through a CETA grant. It is likely that at these particular schools the needs of many handicapped students are being met adequately through the services available outside the SSP.

Several project directors suggested that it is unrealistic to expect SSP to provide the full range and intensity of services the handicapped require, given the limited project resources per student. The director at Wichita State reported that it "costs as much to serve four handicapped students as it does to serve 40 nonhandicapped." Thus the institutions, with their substantially greater resources, may be in a better position to meet handicapped students' needs than are the Special Services Projects. When a school enrolls only a few handicapped students, however, it may be infeasible to develop comprehensive services programs and purchase special materials for them. At these institutions, the Special Services Project may be the sole resource available to handicapped students.

ACADEMIC STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS

The majority of Special Services students are freshmen and sophomores who have been in the program one semester or less. In all schools, project enrollment apparently drops sharply after the freshman year, as shown in Table 18, but at most of the four-year colleges it increases again during the junior or senior year. Of the 1,541 student participants, nearly 50 percent are freshmen, 22 percent are sophomores, and 28 percent are upperclassmen. Three projects--UMKC, Drake, and Wichita--enroll graduate students.

Most students have been enrolled in the projects for less time than they have been enrolled at the institution. The largest majority (76%) have been in the program less than two years, yet less than 70 percent of the group are classified as freshmen and sophomores. By the same token, only 16 percent have been SSP participants more than four semesters; yet 30 percent of all SSP participants are upperclassmen and graduate students. What this indicates is a tendency for students to go in and out of the program as its services are needed. It also indicates that projects are flexible enough to serve students when the need for project services arises.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

For the most part the projects conform to guidelines delineating participant eligibility, although they do make exceptions and serve ineligible students in some cases. These exceptions are made, however, under circumstances which project directors feel are in the best interests of the projects and participants. These project directors are reluctant to refuse needed assistance, for example, or to publicly stigmatize the projects and participants by withholding services from the nonpoor or nondeficient. In the light of realities projects must face at the institutions, the staffs have found it necessary to compromise occasionally in order to foster the kind of relationships and image they feel are desirable for the projects' success.

Of the three categories of participants for which Special Services was designed, only one--the low-income student--makes up a substantial proportion of the enrollment in the nine projects. Handicapped students comprise a very minor group (5%) of the participants, apparently because of the technical difficulty and expense involved in furnishing the varied services they require. Only two limited-English-speaking students are enrolled; few such individuals are enrolled at these institutions or reside in this area of the country.

While an emphasis on the low-income student was noted at all projects, there are variations in the exclusiveness with which this criterion is used to identify potential participants. At two sites--Iowa Lakes and SMSU--income is the sole criterion for participation. Three of the projects--Rockhurst, Luther, and Hutchinson--use academic need as the principal determinant of enrollment, and income is considered secondarily. The four remaining projects demonstrate a strong emphasis on serving ethnic minority groups, mainly Black and Mexican-American students who are also both low-income and academically deficient.

Recruitment emphasis appears to relate to the levels of institutional commitment and categories of project-institutional relationships described in Chapter II. At Iowa Lakes and SMSU institutional commitment is low, and the projects are isolated operationally from most other institutional services and activities. The projects adhere strictly to income criteria, using no other determinants of eligibility and making no exceptions in providing services. Because of their lack of visibility and contact, the projects may seldom be requested to extend services to the ineligible student population.

The three projects with an academic emphasis in their enrollment process are in institutions with a strong commitment to the academically high-risk student. The institutions have integrated the projects into the activities they have developed to fulfill the commitment. There is less institutional commitment to the projects

per se than to the high-risk student generally. The projects contribute in various ways to the overall effort toward the high-risk student. Occasionally this means extending SSP services to technically ineligible students, with or without compensation from the ineligible student or institution.

Projects with a strong minority focus are located in institutions highly committed to success of the projects, yet the projects have a high degree of independence in their operations and activities. Some of the projects evolved out of service programs established when large numbers of minority group students began entering the institutions in the late 1960s. The programs were designed to be a liaison and open up communications between the institutions and minority groups. That the projects have filled these functions well is attested to by the current institutional support, status, and independence they enjoy. Because of the projects' tradition and success in serving minority students, it is doubtful that the institutions will encourage changes in their image or recruitment focus.

VI

IMPACTS OF SPECIAL SERVICES PROJECTS

The evaluation identified two different outcomes of the Special Services Projects: impacts on participants and impacts on institutions that sponsor the projects. This chapter describes the impact indicators used in this study, the findings obtained, and relationships between the findings and project characteristics.

IMPACTS ON PARTICIPANTS

Indicators of impact on participating students have their basis in the statements of purposes and goals for the Special Services Program. Congress defined the purpose when it conceived of and authorized the program; that purpose, stated in the Higher Education Act, is to provide services "to assist youths from low-income families with academic potential to enter, continue, or resume their postsecondary education."[1] *Goals* for the program, as set forth in regulations[2] recently proposed by the U.S. Office of Education, are "to increase the retention and graduation rates of such students."

Admission to Institutions

According to the Congressionally defined purpose, entrance to the institutions is one anticipated effect of Special Services Projects. At several institutions in the sample, applicants in the SSP target group have traditionally been prevented from entering for either academic or financial reasons. These institutions are Rockhurst, UMKC, St. Louis University, Drake, and Luther College. Since the inception of Special Services, changes in traditions have occurred at these schools and now, students who fail to measure up to the traditional academic requirements for entrance are admitted on

---

[1] 20 U.S.C. 1070d-1.

[2] *Federal Register*, op. cit.

the advice of the SSP directors. SSP directors identify applicants with poor prior academic performance who appear to have the potential for college work. The institutions rely on the judgment of these directors and on the services which the SSPs will provide; as a result academically deficient students are now admitted to the institutions. Clearly, the changes in admissions practices at these institutions have had an impact on academically disadvantaged students. Where previously they were denied admission, they now have an opportunity to enter schools with traditionally high admissions standards.

SMSU denies admission to academically deficient students--those ranked in the lower third of their high school class--during fall semesters. Hutchinson, Wichita, and Iowa Lakes have open admissions policies. Any high school graduate residing in the areas served by the institutions can be admitted to these schools, and to SMSU during the spring semesters. The Special Services Project at SMSU has had no effect on this institution's admissions policy and consequently no impacts in terms of assisting in the admission of the target populations.

Financial support is a critical requirement for college entrance of students in the SSP target population. It is, of course, critical to continuing and completion of a college program; however, without knowledge of available financial support at the outset, many low-income students probably would not even consider college. All institutions in the sample provide financial aid services to help students apply for the numerous grants, scholarships, loans, and jobs available. Most Special Services Projects help make low-income students aware of available financial aid. Projects at UMKC, Hutchinson, Wichita, and St. Louis publicize the program and the availability of financial aid to students while they are still in high school. These institutions also extend priority to SSP participants in the packaging of financial aid applications.

It is obvious that the extensive financial aid now available has increased the opportunity for low-income students to acquire a postsecondary education. The Special Services Program has had a major impact in publicizing this opportunity and making it accessible to the economically disadvantaged.

One other purpose of Special Services is to assist the dropout--to encourage him to resume his education and help him re-enter and adjust. Several of the projects enroll former dropouts: CHESS has 89; St. Louis, 4: SMSU and Iowa Lakes each enroll 2. At three projects this information is not collected. It is evident that CHESS is the only project making a substantial impact on dropouts, and it appears to be the only project making an effort to serve this group.

Retention

There are two important conditions any college student must meet in order to continue his education: he must show evidence of satisfactory academic progress, and he must obtain financial support. Although other factors are important, poor academic progress or lack of funds usually means his education must be curtailed, at least temporarily. Special Services participants are at risk on both conditions; nearly all are from very low-income families, and most are enrolled in the projects because they have, or did have, academic problems.[1]

Academic Achievement

Despite their earlier difficulties, many Special Services participants are now making satisfactory academic progress. Table 21 shows the proportions of students in each project achieving

---

[1]SMSU and Iowa Lakes participants are selected solely because of income eligibility.

TABLE 21
Proportions of Participants Achieving
G.P.A.s of "C" or Better
Fall Semester, 1975

	Rock-hurst	UMKC	St. Louis	SMSU	CHESS	Iowa Lakes	Luther	Wichita	Hutch-inson	
<20%										
20-39%										
40-59%	X	X[1]		X						3
60-79%			X			X			X	3
80-100%					y		X	X		3

[1] Includes only the students who are being tutored.

grade point averages of "C" or better for the fall semester of 1975. All projects have at least 40 percent who are achieving satisfactorily; six projects have a majority of participants (60% or more) making satisfactory grades. The highest proportions of students making satisfactory progress are in the Luther College, Wichita State, and CHESS projects. Projects with the lowest proportions of students achieving satisfactorily are at Rockhurst, UMKC, and Iowa Lakes.

Generally, students perform well in courses for which they receive tutoring, better in fact, than they do in other courses. As Table 22 shows, a majority of participants (60% or more) at six of the nine projects made grades of "C" or better in tutored courses. Tutoring thus appears to be having a beneficial effect at these projects. The SMSU tutoring efforts seem less effective; tutees making "C" grades or better were in the minority (20-39%) here. The apparent lack of effectiveness of SMSU's tutoring program may relate to the project's earlier-noted unique shortcomings--its isolation, lack of institutional support, and lack of leadership and coordination of services.

In addition to tutoring, other services are provided to assist students in overcoming academic deficiencies, developing study skills, and dealing with problems of various kinds. The services are aimed toward increasing scholastic achievement and assisting students to continue in school. The evaluation was designed to measure effectiveness of these components, but only rarely was there sufficient information available to do so. Projects generally do not maintain counseling records that reveal "progress," or outcomes of counseling services, and most instructional services (such as reading and study skills components) either do not assess progress in a formal way or had not done so at the time of the field visits. However, since the components have the overall goals of enabling students to remain in school, the general scholastic and retention indicators will be used to indicate effectiveness of the separate components.

TABLE 22
Proportions of Participants Achieving
Grades of "C" or Better in
"Tutored Courses"

	Rock-hurst	UMKC	St. Louis	SMSU	CHESS	Iowa Lakes	Luther	Wichita	Hutch-inson	
Not Applicable						X				1
<20%										
20-39%				X						1
40-59%										
60-79%	X		X							2
80-100%					X		X	X	X	4
Not Available		X								1

Dropout Rates

With a few exceptions, participants are remaining in school, completing the school terms, and returning to continue their studies after semester and summer "breaks." As Table 23 shows, SMSU was the only project in which a majority of last year's participants discontinued their educational programs. At five institutions, between 80 and 100 percent of the project participants completed the last semester and either graduated or returned for the fall semester this year. Statistics furnished by the projects and shown in Table 24 indicate proportionately low dropout rates. All except two projects reported a dropout rate of less than 10 percent for the spring semester of 1975.

Officially the projects aim to encourage students to continue their education, and the staffs, in most instances, do everything possible to keep participants in school. They counsel them, instruct them, and when academic suspension is imminent, they advocate to get them a second chance. Despite the level of effort to retain students and apparent success of this effort, the fact remains that college is not the most appropriate path for some students. This reality is recognized by some project directors who attempt to help students identify alternatives--such as vocational school, employment, other types of colleges, military service. Moreover, attempts are made to identify such students as quickly as possible in order to minimize the students' investment of time in unsuitable endeavors and their debt for educational loans. These project directors thus do not necessarily view all attrition as a negative feature, since they realize that dropping out of school and into more appropriate endeavors is sometimes in the students' best interest.

Financial Aid

Virtually all Special Services participants receive financial aid. For most, this aid is a package consisting of Federal grants

TABLE 23
Proportions of Participants Completing
Last Term and
Re-Entering This Term

	Rock-hurst	UMKC	St. Louis	SMSU	CHESS	Iowa Lakes	Luther	Wichita	Hutch-inson	To-tal
<20%				X						1
20-39%										
40-59%										
60-79%		X	X						X	3
80-100%	X					X	X	X		5

TABLE 24
Proportions of Participants Leaving
School During Spring Semester, 1975

	Rock-hurst	UMKC	St. Louis	SMSU	CHESS	Iowa Lakes	Luther	Wichita	Hutch-inson	
<5%		X	X		X					3
5-9%	X			X			X		X	4
10-14%								X		1
15-19%						X				1
>19%										

(such as Basic Educational Opportunity Grants or Supplemental Grants) scholarships, loans, and part-time jobs. However, for many of the participants the aid package falls somewhat short of what is needed to meet their basic subsistence and educational requirements. Table 25 indicates the proportions of participants receiving financial aid adequate to cover necessary expenses.[1] Despite the evident economic hardship, however, very few leave school for financial reasons. During the 1975-76 fall semester, out of a total participant population exceeding 1,500, 75 left the institutions, and only 13 terminated for financial reasons.

Progress Toward Graduation

In accordance with the program goal of "increasing graduation rates" of the target populations, information was gathered from the projects to measure progress toward graduation. As indicators of progress, statistics were collected on increases in academic status (e.g., number of participants progressing from freshman to sophomore status) after the spring semester of 1975.

There is substantial variation among the projects in the pace with which participants progress through the academic levels toward graduation. Three projects had very substantial proportions (80-100%) of participants who progressed in status or graduated last year, as Table 26 shows. One project, on the other hand, had fewer than 20 percent who "progressed" or graduated.

The variations in progress appear to be due at least partially to project policy and philosophy. Some are operating under the concept that a slower-paced program is more suitable for the students.

---

[1]For purposes of this study, "necessary expenses" include the costs of tuition, books, fees, and other required costs of attending an institution, plus subsistence to cover minimal living costs. The estimates of subsistence included here are the same as those considered by the financial aids offices at the institutions in calculating student need for assistance.

TABLE 25
Proportions of Participants Receiving
Adequate Financial Aid

	Rock-hurst	UMKC	St. Louis	SMSU	Drake	Iowa Lakes	Luther	Wichita	Hutch-inson	To-tal
<20%			X	X						2
20-39%										
40-59%										
60-79%										
80-100%		X				X	X	X	X	5
Not Available	X				X					2

* As needed to cover necessary educational and living costs according to formulas employed by financial aids offices at the various institutions.

TABLE 26
Proportions of Students Progressing
in Academic Status or Graduating
(Spring Semester, 1975)

	Rock-hurst	UMKC	St. Louis	SMSU	CHESS	Iowa Lakes	Luther	Wichita	Hutch-inson	To-tal
<20%				X						1
20-39%		X								1
40-59%						X				1
60-79%			X		X				X	3
80-100%	X						X	X		3

The impacts measured by the study appear to bear little relationship to program characteristics or to the level of institutional commitment to the projects. Projects having high levels of institutional commitment (UMKC, St. Louis, CHESS, and Wichita) vary substantially in their effects on participant academic achievement and progress toward graduation. Participants at Iowa Lakes who receive virtually no project services are making satisfactory academic achievement and generally faring as well as or better than their counterparts receiving a full package of services from other projects. Undoubtedly, the explanation for this phenomenon lies in intervening variables outside the scope of this study. One such variable may be the extent of the participants' academic deficiency at the time of enrollment in the project. Iowa Lakes students are apparently progressing without the projects' help, and possibly many of these participants had no need for Special Services when they enrolled in the project. Students in other projects may have been initially more deficient than those at Iowa Lakes; thus, their current similarity to Iowa Lakes students in academic achievement may represent substantial progress.

Institutional differences may account for some of the difficulty in cross-comparing these data. For example, grading standards vary among institutions; because of this, the use of grades as a comparative impact measure has built-in flaws.

Finally, differences in outcomes among similar projects may be due to participant attitudes and activities that can be gathered only from the participants themselves. Service usage, attendance at tutoring sessions, and other factors may strongly influence the amount of impact a program is able to make on its participants.

IMPACT ON INSTITUTIONS

Limited resources and other constraints on the SSPs limit the extent to which they can meet the total needs of participants. Consequently, the projects must rely on the institutions for support

and assistance. In many instances, institutions have to change traditional policies, practices, and services in order to offer the support required by SSP target groups and other students as well.

Since the inception of the nine Special Services Projects, many changes have occurred at the institutions which suggest the evolvement of new commitments to the low-income, academically high-risk student. Other changes indicate an institutional recognition of and responsibility for nonacademic as well as academic needs of students. In Table 27 observable changes occurring at the various institutions are listed and categorized. These are changes which were reported by institutional officials to have been influenced at least partially by the example or active intervention of the SSPs.

Admission and Retention Policies

As discussed earlier, a direct effect of Special Services was a change in admission and retention practices at some institutions. In order to receive Special Services grants and serve students eligible for the program, institutions were required to admit such students and retain them long enough to overcome past scholastic deficiencies. At the institutions with high admission standards, allowing entry to academically high-risk students represented a change in tradition. As the table indicates, such a change has occurred at five of the schools; three other institutions--Iowa Lakes, Wichita, and Hutchinson--have traditionally had open admissions policies which are not the result of SSP. The project at SMSU has not had an effect on the school's admission or retention practices, and SSP students are given no special consideration either in admission or retention.

It is notable that almost all institutions that have modified their traditional admission and retention practices have done so principally to give consideration to potential SSP participants. Only

TABLE 27
Impacts on Institutions

	Rock-hurst	UMKC	St. Louis	SMSU	CHESS	Iowa Lakes	Luther	Wich-ita	Hutch-inson	To-tal
Liberalized admissions policies			X							1
Special consideration in admitting students if SSP takes them	X	X			X		X			4
Liberalized retention policies								X		1
Retention policies waived for SSP students		X			X					2
Grading policies								X	X	2
New instruction programs for high-risk students										
Tutoring	X	X	X							3
Study Skills	X	X	X							3
Reading	X	X	X		X			X		5
Other Remedial	X	X	X		X			X	X	6
English							X			1

(Continued on next page)

TABLE 27
Impacts on Institutions
(Cont.)

	Rock-hurst	UMKC	St. Louis	SMSU	CHESS	Iowa Lakes	Luther	Wich-ita	Hutch-inson	To-tal
6. New Counseling programs										
Testing	X		X							2
Personal growth, adjustment	X									1
Academic							X			1
Career	X	X							X	3
Other										
Orientation										
7. New programs for high achieving students	X	X								2
8. Other										
Recruiting more minorities	X	X						X	X	4
Service Coordination					X				X	2
Minority Studies Program								X		1

one institution--St. Louis University--has liberalized its admissions practices generally, and only one--Wichita State--has a liberalized retention policy that applies to other than SSP participants. Conceivably, then, the liberal retention and admissions practices might cease without the presence of the SSPs or similar programs for the academically high-risk students.

Compensatory Instruction

As Table 27 indicates, seven of the institutions have established compensatory instructional programs as a result of the SSP's influence. (The two other institutions--Iowa Lakes and SMSU--have programs of this type that predate Special Services.)

The compensatory instructional services are delivered in a variety of different ways. At St. Louis University and Hutchinson College, these services are provided through Special Services Projects. Funds are made available by these institutions or by the non-SSP clients to cover the cost of extending SSP tutoring and remedial instruction to nonparticipants.

Just prior to the fall semester of 1975, learning centers were established at Rockhurst and UMKC to provide remedial instruction, study skills classes, and individualized instruction programs. Officials at both these institutions cited the SSPs as influential in the decisions to establish learning centers.

Wichita State and Drake Universities have developed remedial instruction. Wichita State has a Reading Lab which has been expanded since the inception of Special Services and the consequent increased numbers of academically deficient students. The CHESS program was partially responsible for stimulating the founding of tutoring programs for non-poor students at both Drake and DMACC. At DMACC a program was established specifically for veterans who were not eligible for CHESS because of their income. Drake University sponsors a comprehensive basic skills program during both the regular school term and the summer session for high-risk students ineligible for the SSP.

UMKC and Luther College offer compensatory and tutorial services through the academic departments. An innovative tutoring program at Luther College was developed to improve writing and composition skills of SSP participants and other high-risk students; tutoring is provided by English education majors enrolled in a required practicum course for which they receive one hour of credit.

Counseling

Establishment of new counseling programs at several institutions have been influenced by SSPs in varying degrees. Hutchinson College now has a special studies office and coordinator to assist students in planning and arranging for individualized academic programs. Career counseling services for all students have been upgraded markedly because of the availability of SSP resources; SSP provided career counseling for all students at the college. The project at St. Louis University extends counseling as well as instructional services to students ineligible for the SSP. Hutchinson College and St. Louis University supplement the project resources for these services. UMKC is making special efforts to upgrade its career counseling for minority group and academically deficient students. Part of this effort involves a systematic program of contacting these students, and part involves encouragement of students by the SSP staff and consulting counselor to meet with career counselors at the institution.

Innovative counseling programs at Rockhurst were developed to assist students in personal growth and career selection, although the extent to which these were influenced by the SSP is somewhat questionable. Several spokesmen for the college indicated that SSP had created a new awareness of nonacademic needs of students; others attribute the concepts for the new services to the counselors' professional skills and state-of-the-art knowledge of their fields.

An unexpected impact at Rockhurst and UMKC is a growing concern by some officials over the increasing emphasis on the underachiever. They sense that this is accompanied by a de-emphasis of needs of other students and a compromise of the institutions' high scholastic standards. As a result, some of the Rockhurst administrators and faculty are advocating new programs to provide greater challenges and incentive for the high-achieving student.

Minority Group Emphasis

Several projects are credited with the fostering of increased activity in the area of racial integration on the campuses. Rockhurst, UMKC, Wichita State, and Hutchinson have increased their enrollments of minority group students. UMKC and Wichita State have increased the number of Black faculty and staff members. There is a minority studies program at Wichita State which the SSP director had a role in establishing. The Hutchinson and CHESS project staffs have been instrumental in coordinating services for minority groups on the campuses and in the communities.

Analysis of Findings

It is clear that institutional change occurs where there is institutional commitment to either the Special Services Project itself or to the responsibility of assisting the project's target population. Where commitment is absent, as it is at Iowa Lakes and SMSU, the projects are ineffective as agents of institutional change.

Institutional changes are pervasive, particularly in the areas of compensatory education, counseling services, and minority group emphasis. Many factors have been at work to influence change, including new Federal funding and legislation, and demands from minority groups for better educational opportunity. Also, an increasing need for compensatory instruction by all groups has been noted by educators on many campuses, a phenomenon due either to decreasing quality of primary and secondary education or to the liberalized college admissions policies.

Consequently, it is difficult to isolate the precise role of the Special Services Projects in bringing about changes that have occurred in the institutions. In a number of instances, project staffs were clearly instrumental in bringing about change through direct advocacy, according to officials at the institutions. In other cases, the projects were reported to have served as a model for new institutional services for the high-risk student.

VII

IMPLICATIONS OF STUDY FINDINGS

A number of issues emerge from the findings and conclusions of this study, which have implications for future evaluation activities and project operations. These issues are enumerated below, and discussed in the following sections.

1. To what extent are projects operating in accordance with Federal law and requirements? Under what circumstances are projects in violation of the requirements?

2. Under what circumstances are the projects developing services, delivery systems and other features that are innovative?

3. To what extent are program goals and purposes achieved? What project characteristics or models result in the greatest benefit to participants?

4. How does the level and pattern of institutional commitment affect program operation and impacts on students?

COMPLIANCE WITH GUIDELINES

In general, the nine projects are operating in accordance with guidelines, and while there are instances in which regulations are not followed, these are minimal. One of the most frequently violated rules is the participant eligibility criterion. Technically ineligible participants are served in a number of cases and with full awareness of the regulation. However, under some circumstances the project staffs have felt that extending services to some ineligible students is in the best interest of the project and its legitimate target group.

At one of the smaller campuses, nondisadvantaged students are tutored by the project; the staff is eager to preserve the program's image as a tutoring service rather than a "dumb-bell" or "poor kids" program. On a small campus, this seems a legitimate consideration. Other projects serve some ineligibles, either on occasion or routinely, because of reluctance to refuse needed services. The policy has enhanced the projects' respect and "public relations" with the institutions' staff and students. Conceivably, any project that is visible and well-regarded will be confronted with requests to extend services to ineligible students. The projects will undoubtedly want to weigh carefully the ramifications of providing and not providing services: i.e., to withhold services when needed and risk the project's image on the campus, or to extend services and be in violation of requirements. The practice at Hutchinson and St. Louis of serving ineligible students appears to be a workable solution to the predicament. Any student may receive certain services from these SSP projects, but the institutions or the students themselves support the cost of service to nonparticipants.

Other requirements not currently being met are primarily those concerning record-keeping, student needs assessment, and student progress assessment. The newly proposed regulations are more specific on these points. During the field visits, prior to issuance of the new regulations, the project staffs often seemed unaware that such information should be gathered and kept on file.

Another obvious area of nonconformance was the full-time directorship requirement. Several projects have no full-time professionals; only a few projects are directed by full-time people. Enforcement of this requirement could be expected to have a noticeable positive effect on the quality of some of the programs.

The project staffs evidenced a sincere interest in operating programs in compliance with performance requirements and goals. Where they were not in compliance, it was usually due to lack of awareness

of rules or to local realities, as in the cases where ineligible students were being served.

INNOVATION

Most projects have been innovative to some extent. The most visible innovations are the services developed to meet student needs and to fill gaps in institutional services as student needs occur. There were also some innovative institutional arrangements, services, administrative practices, assessment systems, and training programs for tutors and peer counselors. Most innovative features are not highly remarkable or sophisticated, but they do represent resourcefulness and imagination in meeting student needs.

The level of innovation appears to be highest in projects with high levels of institutional support, particularly where that support is financial. Undoubtedly the added financial resources have made it possible to finance innovations and put concepts into operation. Another shared characteristic of "high-innovation" projects is their relative autonomy from the institutions, which has the effect of encouraging independent activity and resourcefulness on the part of the projects. The projects that are integral parts of institutions or programs are less innovative, possibly due to lack of funds and freedom to innovate. No innovative features were found in the two projects where institutional commitment is lacking.

ACHIEVEMENT OF GOALS AND PURPOSES

The program's goals and purposes all focus toward one aim: to assist students in the target group in completing a post-secondary educational program. Essentially, this entails increasing the likelihood that a student can enter, remain in, and graduate from his program, and that he can find financing for this endeavor. Outcome measures used in the study indicated varying degrees of success among the projects in helping participants achieve these goals.

There are no apparent relationships between the project characteristics and student progress as measured by the indicators used in this study. Student academic performance varies widely among projects that appear to have very similar characteristics. And by the same token, projects that differ in characteristics show similar impacts on students. The results of this analysis are inconclusive in that they reveal only the extent to which students are achieving, but not the reasons they progress or fail to progress. It is possible that the underlying reasons are identifiable only through examination of intervening variables, such as initial participant need and level of service use. Several other personal qualities of participants may influence their academic achievement: motivation, self-discipline, maturity, and others.

Measurement of intervening variables such as these requires data not accessible at most sites during the field visits. Data for measuring intervening variables would have to be gathered through student surveys and empirical indicators, such as test scores and grades, of academic deficiencies. Without baseline information to detect initial deficiency or need, measurement of actual progress is not possible.

Luther College utilizes a system of "predicted grade point average" as a measure of initial need. The procedure uses standardized test results and high school grades. Such a statistic would be useful as a baseline against which to measure subsequent progress and as a tool for assessing need for project or other services.

Project directors generally agree on the value of assessment in their operations, if they had the benefit of feedback of results to guide them in improving programs and services. They apparently are willing either to assess themselves, although they would like technical assistance in this, or to gather and compile information for an evaluator to use. This being the case, it may be feasible to collect additional information--such as baseline and student survey data--that could not be collected during this pilot study.

INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT

The level and pattern of institutional commitment to a Special Services Project affect the project's ability to assist students in enrolling in the institution, to enroll them in Special Services, and to provide services to them. Institutional commitment also relates to the scope and innovativeness of services the projects offer. Highly committed institutions provide financial support and autonomy to projects, thus creating the appropriate climate and resources for innovation. Projects with somewhat less commitment from institutions are less independent. There is more sharing of resources and services with the rest of the institutions, and projects are integral parts of institutions or programs. There are fewer innovations in these projects, but the institutions demonstrate a strong commitment to high-risk students and have innovated programs to accommodate them.

Where there is no institutional commitment, projects seem isloated from services and cooperation, and direct project services are limited. These projects have had no impact on the institutions and are unlikely to have any because of their low visibility. There is similarly little impact on students. The findings of this study thus suggest strongly that without the support of the institution in which a project operates, the project's performance and resourcefulness in serving its target group are likely to suffer.